OCT 4 1963

28

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/reformationcatho0000jwpo

THE REFORMATION, CATHOLICISM, AND FREEDOM

A.L. Jones
1936

THE REFORMATION CATHOLICISM AND FREEDOM

A STUDY OF ROMAN CATHOLIC AND OTHER MARTYRS, AND OF THE STRUGGLES FOR LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE

BY

J. W. POYNTER

WITH A PREFACE BY THE RT. REV.
A. C. HEADLAM, D.D.
BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BR
375
.P68
1930
58,057

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK AND TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN CO.

First published 1930

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

DEDICATED

TO

MY MOTHER AND MY

FATHER

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

T 4 1963

Thanks are due to the following publishers for leave to print the longer quotations used in this book :

Messrs. William Blackwood and Sons, Ltd., *The History of Scotland*, by Andrew Lang. The Catholic Truth Society, *Catholic London a Century Ago*, by Bishop Ward. Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., *The Catholic Dictionary*, and *The Meaning and Position of the Church of England*, by A. Galton. Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co., *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England*, by Bishop Ward ; *England in the Eighteenth Century*, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, *Rationalism in Europe*, by W. E. H. Lecky.

PREFACE

Mr. Poynter, with whom I am acquainted only through an introduction from the Bishop of Bradford, has asked me to read the MS. of his book and to write a short preface. I have read the work and am prepared to write the preface as I am impressed with the obvious fairness and tolerance, with which Mr. Poynter treats a difficult subject.

Mr. Poynter has, I gather from his book, been a member of the Roman Catholic Church: he has ceased to be a member of it, because he finds that it represents a narrow type of Catholicism, and does not understand religious tolerance.

"The great Roman Church, for example, has stood and stands for the reality of religion. It has spoiled, however, much of its usefulness by its spirit of exclusiveness and intolerance. That spirit is a sign not of Catholicity, but of partial development." But although he has ceased to be a member of the Church of Rome, he shows no unfairness or bitterness in speaking of it. He recognises its religious greatness. He makes full allowance for its mistakes. It is because of this spirit of fairness, not always displayed under such circumstances, that I gladly take the opportunity offered me of saying something on the great issues which Mr. Poynter discusses.

The Penal Acts against Roman Catholics were not (from the point of view of today) a pleasing episode in our history. What was the cause of them? And can they be justified? There are two fundamental facts that have to be remembered. The first is that they only inflicted on Roman Catholics what they had inflicted on others. The Reformation was prepared for by the persecutions of the Lollards. Queen Mary in four years burnt to death more than all the Roman Catholics who were put to death in the next hundred years,

and however brutal the treatment of Ireland may have been, the rule of the Duke of Alva in the Low Countries was more terrible. Then, secondly, this policy was inspired by a great fear—a fear which arose from the claim of the Church of Rome to exercise temporal power over the nations of the world. The Jesuit priest, who paid the death penalty in Queen Elizabeth's day, was a political and national enemy, who was the agent and spy of external powers, who aimed at deposing the Queen, who would have rewarded her assassination, and desired to impose Roman Catholicism by force on the nation.

These reasons explain, but they do not justify the Penal Code. Religious persecution is wrong, because it is contrary to fundamental Christian principles, because it brings, we believe, in the end its own nemesis. Had the mediæval Church been fair and tolerant, the Reformation would have been far different in character. Had England treated Ireland fairly, the Irish people would not be a standing menace to the safety of the Empire. Every movement of intolerance at the present day has its speedy re-action.

The arguments against the use of force or other worldly means for the furthering of religion are twofold. The first is the obvious fact that no system of religion can be so certain and complete as to justify the assumption that its holders have nothing to learn from others.

"Religion" (as Mr. Poynter says) "has been always a vital factor in human life. . . . It is, however, obvious that no system of dogmatic theology has been, or is, able to represent that fact adequately. And systems, however august and valuable, are all partial and largely defective. Therefore tolerance is a duty, and any organisation opposed to tolerance is, at least in that respect, mistaken. Religion is man's spiritual striving after the ultimate Divine reality; so far as he is exclusive and intolerant, thus far he restricts the success of his own efforts."

But there is a second reason even more fundamental for Christians. Any spread of Christianity by violence or unworthy means is inconsistent with Christian principles.

"Put up thy sword into the sheath, for they who take the sword shall perish with the sword." The methods of the Christian Church in spreading Christianity must be those of our Lord Himself. It must appeal to men's reason and conscience, and whatever temporary advantage may seem to come by any other method, the penalty will ultimately have to be paid.

Yet it is very hard to be truly tolerant, and most of our religious difficulties at the present day come because people have not yet learnt the lesson. Perhaps the most conspicuous instance has been the failure of Liberalism. The Liberal movement was a demand for freedom, and on the continent it was especially directed against the Roman Catholic Church; yet when the Liberal found himself in power, he refused the freedom that he had won for himself to the Roman Church. The real cause of this failure in consistency is fear—fear that the Church might regain its power and destroy once more freedom of thought. Yet ecclesiasticism is most dangerous when it is attacked, and the Roman Church can hardly be expected to learn the lesson of tolerance when it finds that those who have demanded it for themselves fail to give it to others.

Protestantism justly complains of the persecutions that it has suffered from Roman Catholicism, but it seldom has the courage when in power to be wisely tolerant.

The Roman Church has not yet learned its lesson. It has been celebrating the centenary of Catholic Emancipation, but there has been no word of gratitude to the nation which gave it its freedom. The most fitting celebration of Catholic Emancipation that it could celebrate would be to learn to practise itself a scrupulous tolerance and fairness in dealing with those of other religions. The most sinister result of the fairness with which the Roman Catholic Church has been treated in this country is the controversial bitterness it displays towards the Church of England.

Mr. Poynter discusses the question of the spread of Roman Catholicism in England, and expresses his opinion that apart from the large increase that comes from the Irish immigration

the growth has been slight. The large number of recorded conversions may, in his opinion, be balanced by a continuous leakage. I do not feel competent to express an opinion on that point. It is, however, important to notice the real increase of the Roman Catholic faith in the British Empire. It is dependent on two races—the French Canadian and the Irish. In Canada it is the French Canadian and the Irish, elsewhere it is the Irish, and the strength of the position lies in the extremely prolific character of both races. A great strength to the Roman Church is the wholesome and determined attribute that the Church has always taken towards birth control. The future of the world lies with those nations and creeds which produce a healthy and vigorous offspring.

To preserve a wholesome belief in the value of tolerance, and to practise it when in power, is often difficult. Yet I think the experience of history will teach its value. If England had governed Ireland justly and fairly the Irish would not be the menace that they are to the Empire. They were driven into the hands of the priests by the persecutions that were directed against them. If the Irish had not been so miserable at home they would not have spread so largely through the Empire. Tolerance and fairness and justice are right, and if consistently pursued will break down the bitterness and unfairness of religious controversy.

A. C. GLOUCESTRE:

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE BY THE RT. REV. A. C. HEADLAM, D.D., BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER vii

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM 1

The present age one of transition—The ideal of "mediævalists"—The problem of truth—The old anti-Papal penal laws—Henry VIII.—The precedents of his action—Edward VI.—Mary—Elizabeth—Sufferings of "recusants"—The problem.

CHAPTER II

THE ENGLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC MARTYRS 13

Definition of "martyr"—The number of the R.C. martyrs—The Carthusians—John Forest—Fisher—More—Sir Adrian Fortescue—The three abbots—Margaret Pole—Rising under Edward VI.—Mary's reaction—Elizabeth—Deposing Bull—Felton—Plumtree—Storey—Thomas Percy—The seminarists—Campion and Parsons—Margaret Clitheroe—Executions of seminarists—Southwell—Earl of Arundel—James I.—Charles I.—Commonwealth—Charles II.—The Beatifications of 1929.

CHAPTER III

SCOTLAND 38

Evils of Scottish Church before Reformation—Papacy and mediæval Scotland—Reformation—"Mr. Patrick"—Knox—Wishart—Beaton—Winzet—Moral effects of Reformation—Monasteries—Mary of Scots—"Tulchan bishops"—Covenant—Charles II.—Guthrie, Govan—Rutherford—Roman Catholics—James II. (VII.)—Witches.

CHAPTER IV

IRELAND 55

Celtic Christianity: Britain and Ireland—Pope Adrian IV., King Henry II., Ireland, and the Normans—Irish religio-racial complications—Henry VIII.—Edward VI.—Mary—Elizabeth—Attitude of Irish bishops—Penal laws—Sad social conditions—Planters—Ulster—Rising of 1641—Cromwell—Slaves to West Indies—Charles II.—James II.—His defeat—Treaty of Limerick—Penalties against Roman Catholic education—Hedge-schools.

CHAPTER V

PAGE

THE ANTECEDENTS: PAPAL MEDIÆVAL POWER 72

The mediæval ecclesiastical ascendancy—Boniface VIII. and *Unam Sanctam*—Papal deposing power—Roman Bishop in primitive Church: Nicæa, Gregory the Great, "Development"—Growth of Papal influence—Innocent III.—Albigenses—The Inquisition—A defence of it—Reply—Execution for heresy in England—The ban of excommunication—"Direct," "indirect," and "directive" theories of Papal power—Estimate of moral effects of the power—Regarded full freedom of opinion as essentially wrong—Logical consequence of that.

CHAPTER VI

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION STRUGGLE 92

Degree of Papal influence in mediæval England—The "accident" theory of the Reformation—Catholic devotional practices in mediæval England—Doubtfulness of Papal claims at Reformation period—The monasteries—Henry VIII.—Edward VI.—Mary—Elizabeth's inevitable break with Rome—Supremacy and Uniformity—Penal laws—Roman Catholic party would have been at least as severe—Pius V.'s deposing Bull—The first Elizabethan Roman Catholic martyr—Degree to which Roman Catholics outwardly conformed—The persecutions by Roman Catholic powers—Spain—The Netherlands—Results of the deposing Bull—An "explication" of it—The seminarists—Allen on persecution of heretics—Elizabethan Government's self-defence necessitated—Projected invasions—Armada—Gunpowder Plot—Charles I.—Charles II.—Treaty of Dover—James II.—The "popular monarchy" theory as to him—Reply.

CHAPTER VII

FROM 1688 TO EMANCIPATION 113

Fall of James II.—William and Mary—Declaration of Right—Importance of the issue—Scotland—Scottish rising of 1689; Glencoe—Ireland—Siege of Derry—James's Irish Parliament—The Boyne—Limerick Treaty—More anti-"Papist" laws in England—Persecutions by, and warlike attitude of, Continental Catholic powers—Treaty of Westphalia—Corruption of English Parliament—Rotten boroughs—Fallacy of an argument from this, and for Papal deposing power—Stuart risings of 1715 and 1745—Apparently hopeless position of Roman Catholics.

CHAPTER VIII

PAGE

EMANCIPATION 130

Limerick Treaty violated—Roman Catholics barred from Irish Parliament—Penal laws—Mentality behind the penal laws in Ireland—Irish penal laws in reign of Anne—Priests hunted—*Soggarth aroon*—Degradation of native Irish under the penal laws—Irish trade restricted—Potato-famine, 1723—Whiteboys—Oakboys—Steelboys—Defenders—Peep-o'-Day Boys—Grattan—Roman Catholic Vicars-Apostolic in England—Hard life of Roman Catholic clergy in England—Dr. Challoner—Lowered spiritual condition of English Roman Catholics under penal laws—The four Districts—Relief Act of 1778—Approaches towards Emancipation—*Peter Plymley's Letters*—A reply—Motives of penal laws—Roman Catholic places of worship—Fewness of English Roman Catholics—Catholic Committee—Saville Act—Gordon Riots—Cisalpinism—Bishop Milner—Bishop Poynter—Opening of St. Mary's, Moorfields—Scotland—Ireland—War-like secret societies—The "'98"—United Irishmen—"Back Lane Parliament's" delegates to England—Pitt—The "Veto"—Approaches to Emancipation—O'Connell and the "Association"—Victory.

CHAPTER IX

AFTER EMANCIPATION 157

Position of English Roman Catholics in 1829—A Roman contrast to Emancipation—Ireland and its disturbed state—Complications of race and creed—Maynooth synod—The famine of the 'forties—Outrages—Irish depopulation after famine—Effect of Irish famine on English Roman Catholicism—Irish disestablishment—Irish Roman Catholic education—Quaintness, but heroism, of the hedge-schools—Irish universities—Dispersion of the Irish—Scotland—Reunion of English Roman Catholic parties—*Emigrés*—Oxford Movement—Wiseman and the revival of Roman Catholicism—Opening of St. George's Cathedral—Comparison with 1908 Eucharistic Congress—The Hierarchy—Subsequent progress — Conversions to Rome — Leakage — Manning — Vaughan—Anglican Orders—Westminster Cathedral—Archbishop (Cardinal) Bourne—"The Second Spring"—"Conversion of England"—Roman Catholic organisations—Religious Orders—The Press.

CHAPTER X

PAGE

BASIC PRINCIPLES 191

Uncertainty of philosophy—Necessity of toleration—"Mysteries"—Religion and toleration—Naturalness, but fallacy, of exclusivism—Papal claim to dominance—Papal coronation—Leo XIII. on Church and State, and on liberties—Infallibility—Oates's "Popish Plot," and the state of England then—True solution of problems of Church and State is in liberty—Nobility of Latin Church: Faber—But it is not "the whole"—*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*—Conclusion: liberty and co-operation the keys to progress.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY 203

INDEX 207

THE REFORMATION, CATHOLICISM, AND FREEDOM

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

We live in an age of many strangely varying tendencies. It is religious, and yet sceptical; diverse, yet tending to unity; full of innovation, yet having more reverence than the previous generation had for many traditions of long-past times. The hard materialism, which had so many advocates two generations ago, is obsolete; but, on the other hand, the formal appeal to ecclesiastical or dogmatic authority has little general effect. As to tradition and innovation, the present age throbs with new life and energy, but, in that very joy of discovery, many minds look with higher appreciation on the past. We no longer regard the Middle Ages, for example, as mere times of incomprehensible barbarism. For all their limitations, we recognise that they had many elements of greatness which our own age lacks. Thus, the very tendency to innovation, in our times, has caused us to revise, in a more sympathetic way, our conceptions of the past.

It is here that the ancient and venerable Roman Catholic Church finds opportunity, in English-speaking countries especially, for intensive propaganda. We are disillusioned in many ways; there is a feeling that there is some radical defect in our social structure; it is recognised, also, that the fierce controversies of "Papist" and "Protestant," in past generations, often turned on trivial points or on matters as to which there was an essential misunderstanding. In

some quarters, then, there is a tendency to ask, How far are our troubles due, or largely due, to our separation from "the current of the historic Catholic culture": in other words, how far are they due to the effects of the Reformation?

In the opinion of the present writer, such a question rests on a radical mistake: and he thinks so all the more because for a considerable time he was influenced by it himself. For one thing, the pre-Reformation ages were at least as confused as is our own. Even so zealous a Roman Catholic advocate as Mr. Hilaire Belloc says (*How the Reformation Happened*, 1928, pp. 29-30): "The conception, then, of the Christian centuries between the Peace of the Church under Constantine and the crash of the sixteenth century, as a period of fixed, easy, united Catholicism, is most erroneous. It was all peril, all conflict, and all recurring imminence of disaster; the final catastrophe just barely staved off time after time, and that only in a part of what once had been our general European culture: for the South and South-east were abandoned to Mohammedanism." Indeed, the very fact that mediæval culture was dominated by religion, and was formed amidst war and confusion, tended to make it essentially defective in so far as religion became largely identified with a warlike, centralised ecclesiasticism.

Adequate or not, however, the mediævalist ideal has considerable attraction for many minds. An analysis of the problems connected with it, and with the Reformation and modern ideals, is all the more opportune in view of the recent centenary of the passing of the "Catholic Emancipation Act" of 1829. In questions of the rights of conscience are implied further questions of what is truth; how can we know it; how far can any organisation, such as a Church, be the means of its expression; what should be the attitude of civil States to religion; and how these problems have been worked out in past times. In this book these problems will not be treated from a partisan point of view, but rather from one which may be illustrated by these words from the Platonic dialogue *Philebus*: "For we

surely do not now desire to enter into a contest in order that what I lay down, or what you do, may gain the victory; but we ought both of us to unite in fighting for what is the most true."

The old "anti-Roman penal laws" are largely forgotten. Yet the study of them is full of tragic interest.

In 1533 was enacted the law (24 Henry VIII., chapter xii.) prohibiting further appeals to the Pope; declaring that, in ecclesiastical causes which were concerned with the king and the royal family, no appeal should be made to the Pope, and that the decrees of Convocation of the Church of England should be taken for "a final decree."

In 1534 it was enacted (25 Henry VIII., chapter xix.) that the king's consent was to be required for making canons for the Church of England, and that the Court of Chancery would deal henceforward with appeals of the ecclesiastical courts, such appeals no longer to go to the Pope. In the same year it was enacted also (chapter xx.) that in future no leave was to be asked from the Pope for the making or consecration of bishops; that (chapter xxi.) the king and the English archbishops would give thenceforward the dispensations hitherto granted by the Pope; and finally, by the great Act of the *Supremum Caput*, it was declared that the king is supreme head of the Church in England, and that the Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction in this realm.

In 1535, the Acts 26 Henry VIII., chapters i. and iii., gave to the king all the first fruits and the first year's revenues of all benefices, including those belonging to bishoprics. In the same year, Anne Boleyn's chaplain, Shaxton, was consecrated Bishop of Salisbury without the previous obtaining of any Bulls from Rome. On May 4, some monks of the Carthusian order were put to death, in circumstances of great pathos and cruelty, for refusing to admit the right of the king to be supreme head of the Church. On June 22, Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, was executed for a like refusal, and, on July 6, a similar fate overtook Sir Thomas More, formerly Lord High

Chancellor of England and a favourite companion of the very king who now had him executed.

Thus was abolished from England the Papal jurisdiction which—with varying vicissitudes—had been exercised here for many preceding centuries: and which was now abolished by the same king who, but a few years before, had defended it against Luther. In his work in defence of the seven sacraments—a work dedicated to Pope Leo X., and from whom the king had received in return the title, Defender of the Faith—Henry VIII. had expressed wonder at Luther's audacity in daring, in opposition to all present and former testimony, to deny the undoubted right of the Pope to rule the Catholic Church. Now, however, the face of things was changed, and, in the stress of a matrimonial lawsuit, Henry VIII. found that that right was a fiction.

It is bad history to suppose, however, that the action of Henry VIII., in breaking with the Pope, was an absolute innovation, without any precedent. Henry VIII., it is true, went to the logical extreme, as never had been done before; but English history furnished plenty of previous examples of grave conflicts with Popes. In 1164 the Constitutions of Clarendon enacted, amongst other things tending to a large degree of royal supremacy over the Church, that "in appeals, when they occur, from the archdeacon they ought to proceed to the bishop; from the bishop to the archbishop; and, if the archbishop fail to give justice, last of all recourse must be had to the lord king, that by his precept the controversy may be ended in the court of the archbishop: so that it ought not to proceed further without the assent of the lord king." These Constitutions, it is true, failed, the murder of the primate, Archbishop à Becket, resulting in a Papal reaction; but their very initiation was a symptom of the conflict, always latent, between Papal and royal power. The Statutes of Provisors, Præmunire, and Mortmain (A.D. 1350, 1363, 1389, 1391-2) were similar signs. The statute 16 Richard II., chapter v. (A.D. 1392), for instance, recited a long series of

Papal processes and sentences of excommunication against English bishops; declared that the effect of such processes was that "the Crown of England, which hath been so free at all times that it hath been in no earthly subjection, but immediately subject to God in all things touching the regality of the said Crown, and to none other, should be submitted to the Pope, and the laws and statutes of the realm by him defeated and avoided at his will;" and affirmed that Parliament "will stand with our said lord the king and his said Crown and regality in the cases aforesaid, and in all other cases attempted against him, to live and to die."

It is true that the statutes of provisors and præmunire were to a considerable extent a dead letter; but that was far from being entirely the case, and in any event they were there *in terrorem*, always ready to be invoked should need be. Indeed, it was under the existing statute of præmunire itself that Henry VIII. took his first step in the direction of separation from Rome: when, in 1530, he invoked its penalties against the whole body of the clergy for having acknowledged Wolsey as Papal legate—penalties waived by Henry only at the price of a heavy subsidy from the Church and an acknowledgment by it that the king is Supreme Head ("so far as Christ's law allows" —*quantum per Christi legem licet*—a vain qualification!)

Thus, it is clear that Henry VIII.'s separation from the Papal See was an event by no means unforeshadowed in previous history. It was the logical completion of many things that had gone before. Nevertheless, men's actions are rarely guided by pure logic. The circumstances of the moment guide. Henry VIII. himself maintained for several years a protracted series of negotiations with Rome, and made his definite separation only as a last resource. The Papal jurisdiction, spite of all conflicts, had been so familiar to many generations of Englishmen, and had around it so great a glamour of sacred sanctions throughout all Western Christendom, that definite separation from it could be accomplished only by means of rigorous penal

laws against all who continued to recognise it. The system enforced, during that period of Henry VIII.'s reign after he broke from the Pope, was "Latin orthodoxy without monasteries and with Henry Tudor for Pope."

During the short reign of his successor, Edward VI., the Protestant party was in the ascendant, and definite alterations were made in doctrine and liturgy. By 3 and 4 Edward VI., chapter x., it was enacted that, "if any person shall have in his custody any books called antiphoners, missals . . . or other books for the service of the Church not set forth by the king, he shall forfeit, for the first offence, 20s. [about £12 modern money]; for the second offence, £4; and for the third, be imprisoned at the king's will."

Edward VI.'s successor, Mary, restored the jurisdiction of the Pope by means of the same royal power used by Henry VIII. to abolish it. As an able Jesuit writer (Rev. J. H. Pollen, *English Catholics in Reign of Elizabeth*, p. 2) says: "Queen Mary had, indeed, re-established Church government in its ancient pride of place; but she had done so by an exercise of the same royal power which had previously abrogated it." Mary's Government eventually discovered that the re-enforcement of the old order of things necessitated the use of the stake against the heretics. As to the Marian burnings, it will be sufficient to quote two Roman Catholic writers, one of the last century and one of this. With regard to the burnings themselves, Tierney says (note to Dodd's *Church History*, ii., 103): "To detail them would be a revolting task; the mind would shudder, the heart sicken, at the recital. At times a momentary suspension of cruelty seemed to indicate the presence of a milder spirit. But the illusion was quickly dissipated. New commissions were issued, new barbarities were enacted, and a monument of infamy was erected which even at the distance of three centuries cannot be regarded without horror." With regard to what the prospect would have been had Mary not died prematurely, we may quote Hilaire Belloc (*How the Reformation Happened*, 1928, p. 151): "Had Mary lived we do not know how

much longer the persecution might have continued, nor what further number of victims it might have made. I suggest that they would have been at least double in number before the repression had had its final effect."

However, Mary died, her work incomplete; and, with the accession of Elizabeth, began the long final struggle for the prevalence of the new order of things.

The Act of Supremacy (1 Elizabeth, chapter i.) enacted that "all jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power hath hitherto been exercised . . ., shall for ever, by authority of this Parliament, be united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm." The Act of Uniformity of Worship (1 Elizabeth, chapter ii.) laid down severe penalties for any who, after June 24, 1559, said or heard Mass according to the rite of the Church of Rome. A fine of one shilling—about twelve shillings modern money—was imposed on anyone absenting himself from the service of the Church of England on holy days.

"A commission," wrote John Jewel (afterwards Bishop of Salisbury) to his friend Peter Martyr at Zurich, "is now appointed for the whole of England, with a view to the establishment of religion. Sandys will go into Lancashire, I into Devonshire, others into other parts. The queen declines being styled the head of the Church, at which I am not much displeased. [NOTE.—Elizabeth adopted the style '*Governor*' of the Church, rather than the crude term 'Head']. Meanwhile, what the hangman of the Church [*cavezzo della chiesa*: Jewel meant the Pope!] may think, or murmur, or what trouble he may give us, you who are less distant can hear more easily than ourselves. Our papists oppose us most spitefully, and none more obstinately than those who have abandoned us. This it is to have once tasted of the Mass! He who drinks of it is mad. Depart from it, all ye who value a sound mind; who drinks of it is mad. They perceive that when that palladium is removed, everything else will be endangered."

In order to enforce its policy, the Government of Queen

Elizabeth was compelled to eject from their sees all the bishops (except Kitchen of Llandaff and Stanley of Sodor and Man) who survived from those of Queen Mary's days (the primate, Cardinal Pole, had died almost at the same time as Queen Mary, so Canterbury was vacant; Elizabeth appointed Matthew Parker to the primacy). The policy of the Elizabethan Government was not to replace the old Church with a new, but to reform within the framework of the old. "Cecil was careful not to administer the oath of supremacy to more people than was absolutely necessary; he left the bulk of the clergy undisturbed, and though the Government had to set up a new hierarchy as best they could, yet they took immense pains to get some sort of mechanical continuity, and did in fact achieve this" (H. Belloc, *How the Reformation Happened*, 1928, pp. 11-12). The line proposed to be taken was that of the steady infliction of fines, the ejecting of clergy only where quite unavoidable, and the trust to time to achieve desired results.

It is difficult to estimate the extent to which the clergy conformed to the new *régime*, but probably the great majority did so: though reluctantly and hoping for a change later on. The heads of colleges of Oxford University, however, refused to conform, and were dismissed: Marshall, Dean of Christ Church; Reynolds, Warden of Merton; Coveney, President of Magdalen; Cheadsey, President of Corpus Christi; Wright, Master of Balliol; Hodgson, Provost of Queen's; Hernshaw, Rector of Lincoln; Hythurst, President of Trinity; Belsire, President of St. John's; Marshall, Principal of St. Alban's Hall; Holland, Warden of All Souls'; and Drysale, Master of University College. In Exeter College, as late as 1578, it is said there were not five Protestants out of eighty: "all the rest were secret or open Roman affectionaries. These chiefly came from the West, where Popery greatly prevailed and the gentry were bred up in that religion" (Strype, *Annals*, ii., 539). One gets tragic-humorous sidelights in incidents like this of Dr. Caius (after whom Caius College was named): He was an eminent physician and an adherent of the old ways in

religion; he came in conflict with the Fellows of Gonville Hall, of which he was Master; in Lambeth Palace is a manuscript stating he "maintaineth within his College copes, vestments, albs, crosses, tapers, with all Massing abominations, and termeth them the College treasure": in December, 1572, the Vice-Chancellor of the University headed a pillage of his rooms, "which was done with willing hearts, as it seemed, of all present."

The ruinous system of fines was calculated gradually to crush down those wealthy family estates whose holders refused to conform. Mr. George Cotton, of Warblington, paid £260 each year for twenty years: 1587 to 1607 (some £60,000 modern value). "It must be borne in mind, however, that the receipts of the exchequer were but a trifle compared with the losses sustained by the Catholics by the methods employed to collect the fines, and the consequent waste and wanton destruction of their goods, and, as has been pointed out, 'of the vast sums which found their way into the hands of courtiers, parasites, and favourites, to whom recusants were given to "farm," and pursuivants and informers who made Catholics pay for their forbearance'" (Gasquet, *Hampshire Recusants in Elizabeth's Reign*, pp. 33-34).

In 1593 a statute against "Popish recusants" ordered them "to repair to their own homes," and not to travel five miles therefrom; if they did not possess goods enough to pay the £20 monthly fine, they were to abjure the realm, and, if they failed to do so, they were to suffer as felons. In 1583, "certain poor Catholics," unable to pay the fines, "had been publicly whipped through the [Winchester] city" (Milner, *History of Winchester*, i., 380).

There is great pathos in the records which remain to us of the sufferings of obscure people under the pressure of the penal laws of Queen Elizabeth. Amongst the Rawlinson manuscripts in the Bodleian Library is a folio book containing some such records. It is called *A List of the Roman Catholics in the County of York in* 1604 (a year after Elizabeth's death; but of course the facts date backward).

It is dry enough as a mere official list; but one can imagine the pain and tears which lay beneath the surface of its cold facts. At "Burrowbridg" was "Henry Gibson aforenamed; recusant synce ye 20 of March 1603"; at Burton Leonard, "Jane Lowson an old woman in that parishe—1 yere recusant"; in "Rippley paroch," "Gregory Wilkinson, George Atkinson, Anne wief of William Simpson younger, Margaret wief of John Geldard, recusantes within 12 moneths last"; at "St. Michaell's, Ousebridgend," "Richard Browne, glover, recusant synce March 1603"; at "St. Lawrence parish," "Elizabeth Dalby wedow of good estate, recusant 1 yere, viz., sync March 1603"; at "Downeholme paryshe," "Elizabeth Hagston spinster, a recusant long, Jane Harland, a recusant since xxv Marcii 1603"; in "Wenslow parish," "Parcyrell Thompson, Jane Thompson, William ffosse, Kirtian Colles, Jane Emonston, non-communicants since the xxvth of March 1603"; in "Grinton parishe" there is a long list, no fewer than twenty-three being described as "non-communicants since Easter, 1603," and they vary from "yeomen" to "laborer," "servant," "wife," "daughter of," etc.

One cannot but feel the pathos of the sufferings under the petty persecutions that went on. For example, at Bondgate there were "William Chanler poore, Bridget Chauner his sister, John Geldhart poore"; at "Roclif," "Anne Barwick spinster, a poor maide, an old recusant." At "Mynskip paroch" was "ffrancis Barwick being a poore man doth teach children to write and rede." At Wenslow: "Katheren Russell wedowe, Anne Wate widowe, Thomas Wilson and his wief Isabell Hopps poore, Mary Wallar poore, Dorothie ffawcett poore, Ellen Harrison poore, Thomas Hillarie of Ridmor, recusants & have been long." At "Danbie Wiske": "Margarie Epplebie, Margaret Holden, poore widowes," "Christabell Gaterd, a poore woman," "William Rayson, a poore old man." At Massam: "John Jackson, a blinde man," "Janet Johnson wedowe," and three other "wedows," all "recusants for divers yeares last past and all or most of them

poore." At Easbie there was "Jane Harrison, spinster poor lame woman, a recusant." At Birkbie, "Margaret wife of James Parkinson of Little Smeaton, a blind woman recusant 3 yeares"; at North Ottrington, "Phillis Slidmer, a poore spinster, non-communicant, suspected." At Skelton were several "recusants 8 or 9 yeares but poore laborers"; at Britton, several "notorious recusantes for 7 or 8 years last being poore fishermen"; at Hovingham, a long list of "laborers," "a poore old man," "a poore widowe," and other "recusantes old"; at Marton, "John Dutchman and Ellis his wife verie poor"; at Staveley, "Richard fforest of Staveley laborer, Jayne his wief, recusants 16 yeares." One curious record shows the struggles of conscience in those days: "*Vnreverent receiving* Matthew Haigh yeman at Easter last when he should have received the comunion, the bread being given him, did not eat it, but conveyed it into his book and likewise did not drink ye wine, as him selfe hath synce reported, but onely toke it into his mouthe." We can imagine poor Matthew, torn between his conscience and the law, and trying to compromise with both! One case, indeed, is decidedly romantic: At "Bransbie" we find record of "*Secret mariage* Richard Cholmley Esquier maryed with Mary Hungate in the presence of John Wilson, William Martin, Hugh Hope & Christopher Danyell in a fell with a popishe priest, as they here [hear]."

Picture the lovers meeting secretly the "popishe priest," "in a fell," there plighting their life-vows, and going home! There was romance even under the penal laws.

The warfare between the Papacy and the English Government continued its cruel though intermittent course throughout the reigns of James I., Charles I., under the Commonwealth, under Charles II., and reached a climax in the period of the Catholic James II. With the exception of during the Commonwealth period, of course, Protestant dissenters also were subject to legal disabilities.

What is the problem which such events raise for our consideration? It may be summed up in these questions: What is the real nature of liberty of conscience? How

far should the State have jurisdiction in matters concerned with religion or with mere *belief*, as such? How far has the claim of any Church to be intolerant, and to call upon the State also to be intolerant, been responsible for evils such as have been mentioned in this chapter?

In following chapters we shall sketch the tragic events connected with the struggles of the Reformation in these islands; and, first, the "Catholic martyrs": a grim history too little known to Protestants—and, it is to be feared, somewhat misunderstood also by Roman Catholics from their opposite point of view.

CHAPTER II

THE ENGLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC MARTYRS

WHAT is a "martyr"? According to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, martyrdom is "the voluntary endurance of death for the faith [*i.e.*,for the Roman Catholic faith], or for some other act or virtue relating to God" (Pope Benedict XIV., *De Canonizatione*, book 3). Thus, no one would be a martyr who died simply for his country, or for any belief other than religious; nor who died for any belief other than that of the Roman Catholic Church.

Such a definition, of course, can be accepted only by Roman Catholics. When, however, another definition is attempted, the question arises: Is *the objective truth of a person's belief* a factor in deciding whether he is entitled to the name "martyr"? If so, then there is little chance of agreeing as to who are martyrs; for there are endless different opinions as to what doctrines are true.

Probably a good solution is that a martyr is a person who gives his or her life for a belief conscientiously held by such person to be true. There are 360 men and women who, under either of these definitions, are entitled to be counted martyrs because they gave their lives for the Roman Catholic Church during the struggles of the Reformation in England.

During the reign of Henry VIII. there were fifty: In 1535, six Carthusian monks, one priest (John Haile), one Bridgettine monk, the Bishop of Rochester (John Fisher), and the layman Sir Thomas More; in 1537, eleven Carthusians (six monks and five lay brothers) and one Franciscan friar (Anthony Brookby); in 1538, one Augustinian canon and three Franciscan friars (one of the friars being the celebrated John Forest, burnt at Smithfield); in 1539, two laymen (Sir Adrian Fortescue and Sir Thomas Dingley), three

Benedictine abbots (of Glastonbury, Reading, and Colchester), four lesser Benedictine monks, one Franciscan friar (John Waire or Maire), and one Augustinian canon; in 1540, four priests, one lay gentleman (Clement Philpot), and one Carthusian lay brother (William Horne); in 1541, Sir David Gunston and Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury; in 1544, two priests and two laymen.

There were no Roman Catholic martyrs under Edward VI.; in the reign of Queen Mary, the 286 persons burnt at the stake were of course all Protestants; but the number of those counted Roman Catholic martyrs during the reign of Queen Elizabeth is 210 (including twenty technically at present listed at Rome as *dilati*—"the introduction of whose cause is postponed for fuller evidence").

Under James I., there were twenty-six persons who are counted as Roman Catholic martyrs, as well as three *dilati*. Under Charles I., two martyrs (the Jesuit, Edmund Arrowsmith, and a farmer, Richard Herst), and six *dilati*. Under the Commonwealth, counting from 1641: twenty-four martyrs and two *dilati*. In the reign of Charles II., twenty-four martyrs (victims of the Titus Oates plot) and eleven *dilati*.

The Carthusians executed under Henry VIII. were, of course, victims of their refusal to acknowledge that monarch as Head of the Church. Froude (*History of England*, ii., 379-380) writes thus of the executions of John Houghton and four companions (including John Haile the priest and Richard Reynolds, the Bridgettine), on May 4, 1535: "Houghton, as the first in rank, had the privilege of first dying. When on the scaffold, in compliance with the usual custom, he spoke a few touching and simple words to the people. 'I call to witness Almighty God,' he said, 'and all good people, and I call you present to bear witness for me in the Day of Judgment, that being here to die, I declare that it is from no obstinate rebellious spirit that I do not obey the king, but because I fear to offend the Majesty of God. Our Holy Mother the Church hath decreed otherwise than the king and parliament have

decreed, and therefore, rather than disobey the Church, I am ready to suffer. Pray for me, and have mercy on my brethren, of whom I have been the unworthy prior.' He then knelt down, repeating the first few verses of the 31st Psalm, and after a few moments delivered himself to the executioner. The others followed, undaunted. As one by one they went to their death, the Council, at each fresh horrible spectacle, urged the survivors to have pity on themselves; but they urged them in vain. The faces of these men did not grow pale; their voices did not shake; they declared themselves liege subjects of the king, and obedient children of Holy Church, 'giving God thanks that they were held worthy to suffer for the truth.' All died without a murmur. The stern work was ended with quartering the bodies; and the arm of Houghton was hung up as a bloody sign over the archery off Charterhouse, to awe the remaining brothers into submission. But the spirit of the old martyrs was in these friars."

John Forest, the Franciscan friar, was burnt at Smithfield on May 22, 1538. He was hanged over a fire by means of a chain round his waist. In the fire had been placed a wooden statue of a mounted warrior, called Darvel Gathern: a noted Welsh object of veneration, which had been brought especially to London for the purpose of derisive burning with Forest. The reason of this was that an old tradition had predicted that it would one day burn a forest! On the gallows from which the friar hung were set up two rude verses, one to Gathern, the other this:

"And Forest the frier,
That obstinate lyer,
That wilfully shal be dead,
In his contumacie
The Gospell doth deny,
The Kyng to be Supreme Head."

The preacher at the burning of Forest was the celebrated Hugh Latimer.

The executions of Bishop Fisher of Rochester and Sir Thomas More, however, marked with the light of fierce

drama the fact that the quarrel between King and Pope was to be one to the death. John Fisher was the son of Robert Fisher, a merchant of Beverley. After passing through Cambridge University, he became Vicar of Northallerton in Yorkshire. He resigned his benefice, however and became Master of Michaelhouse, Cambridge. Later, he was appointed chaplain and confessor to Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby (mother of King Henry VII.). It was under Fisher's guidance that the countess founded St. John's and Christ's Colleges, at Cambridge, as well as the Lady Margaret professorships at that University and at Oxford.

In 1504 Fisher was appointed Bishop of Rochester. He had a great reputation as a preacher, and his sermon at the funeral, in 1509, of King Henry VII. still exists. He was a great patron of learning, and he invited Erasmus to visit Cambridge. In 1521 he preached at St. Paul's Cross, in London, at a public burning of books of Luther's. The great question of Henry VIII.'s divorce from Catherine of Arragon found Fisher a warm favourer of Catherine's cause. Indeed, he pleaded it before Wolsey and Campeggio, the papal legates. When, however, the Pope revoked the case to Rome, Fisher's part in it ceased. He became a strong opponent of the king's anti-papal policy in parliament. Henry, indeed, prompted the House of Commons to make, through its Speaker, a remonstrance against Fisher's attacks on parliamentary policy. In 1530 Fisher joined with the Bishops of Bath and Ely in appealing to the Pope against the royal encroachments on the Church. The three prelates were arrested, but soon liberated, and in the following year the king compelled Convocation to grant the Crown a subsidy of £100,000, together with a recognition of the royal supremacy (*quantum per Christi legem licet*). An incident may be mentioned here which led to the enactment of a barbarous punishment for poisoners. An attempt which was made to poison Fisher, and as a result of which two of his servants died, caused Parliament to class poisoning as high treason, the punishment to be boiling alive.

In June, 1532, Fisher preached against the king's project of divorce. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Warham) dying, Cranmer was appointed primate, and matters took a swift move forward. In 1533 a fanatic ("the Holy Maid of Kent") caused a great sensation by pretended prophecies against the king, and in March, 1534, a special Bill of Attainder was passed against Fisher and others for complicity with her. Fisher was sentenced to deprival of goods and perpetual imprisonment, but was pardoned on paying a fine of £300. Shortly afterwards Fisher was called upon to take the oath acknowledging the offspring of Henry and Anne Boleyn as legitimate heirs to the throne. Refusing, he was committed to the Tower of London, was again attainted (this time for misprision of treason), and was deprived of his see of Rochester. In May, 1535, Pope Paul III. created him a Cardinal. The fury of Henry was unmeasured. "Has the Pope given him a hat?" he cried; "then I will send his head to Rome to wear it!" On June 17 he was tried for high treason in having denied the king's title of Supreme Head. Condemned to be hanged, drawn, and quartered, he received the mitigated punishment of beheading instead (June 22).

Fourteen days later, on the same Tower Hill, was beheaded the illustrious Sir Thomas More. The story of More's life is too well known to need recapitulation here. Suffice it that until the great question of the divorce arose, he was high in favour with Henry: indeed, was one of the king's favourite companions. More, of course, was not altogether superior to the spirit of his age (who is?), and, though the tone of broadest tolerance runs through his *Utopia*, his actual attitude to heretics was very different. His opinion as to how they should be treated was expressed thus in an answer he wrote to Tyndale, the translator of the Bible (it will be noted that More's gaiety of wit peeps out of even this grim matter): "I woulde not here note, by the way, that Tyndal here translateth *no* for *nay*, for it is but a trifle and mistaking of the englishe word: sauing [except] that ye shoulde see that he whych in two so plain englishe

words, and so common as is *naye* and *no*, can not tell when he should take the tone, and when the tother, is not for translating into englishe, a man very mete. For the vse of those two words in annswerring to a queſtion is this, *Nay* annswereth the queſtion framed by the affirmative. As for ensample, if a manne should aske Tindall hymselfe: 'ys an heretike mete to translate holy scripture into englishe?'—lo, to thys queſtion, if he will aunswere trew englishe, he muſte aunswere *nay* and not *no*. But and if this queſtion be asked hym thus, lo: 'Is not an heretyque mete to translate holy scripture into english?'—to this queſtion, lo, if he wil aunswer true english, he muſt aunswere *no* and not *nay*. And a lyke difference is there betweene these two adverbs, *ye* and *yes*. For if the queſteion bee framed unto Tindall by the affirmative in this fashion: 'If an heretique falsely translate the newe testament into englishe, to make hys false heresyes seeme the worde of Godde, be hys bookes worthy to be burned?'—to this queſtion asked in thys wyse, yff he wyl aunswere true englishe, he muſt aunswere *ye* and not *yes*. But nowe if the queſtion be asked hym thus, lo, by the negatiue, 'If an heretike falsely translate the newe teſtament into englishe, to make hys false heresyes seme the word of God, be not his bokes well worthy to be burned?'—to thys queſtion in this fashion framed, if he wyll aunswere trew englyshe, he maye not aunswere *ye*, but he muſt aunswere *yes*, and say, 'Yes, mary, be they, bothe the translacion and the translatour, and al that wyll holde wyth them.'"

On April 13, 1534, More appeared at Lambeth Palace to answer the summons to take the oath recognising the legitimacy of the succession of Henry and Anne Boleyn, and repudiating the Papal authority. He declared himself willing to swear to observe the provisions of the Succession Act, but refused to repudiate the Papal authority or acknowledge the divorce from Catherine as just. On April 17 he was sent to the Tower. He remained there for over a year, and, though his health was weak, his good courage never left him. "Is not this house as nigh heaven as

mine own?" he asked on one occasion. On July 1, 1535, he was indicted for high treason, and was condemned to be hanged at Tyburn. The king, however, mitigated the sentence to one of beheading. "I trust," said More, "that my friends may be spared such a mercy!" He was executed on July 6, and his head was stuck on London Bridge—replacing that of his friend Fisher, which had also been exhibited there.

In 1537 the process of dissolving the larger monasteries was carried out drastically, and, during its course, the king was much angered by the long resistance of the London Charterhouse (house of Carthusian monks) to demands on its inmates to take the oath recognising the king as Head of the Church. Ultimately, the number who held out was ten: Johnson, Bere, Green (professed monks), Davy ("referendarius"), and Salt, Greenwood, Redyng, Shryne, Pierson, and Horne (lay brothers). "There had been enough, however, of the scaffold already for the Charterhouse: and for the ten recusants were reserved the more horrible but less conspicuous torments of the dungeon. They were committed to Newgate, May 29: and were subjected there to such frightful treatment that in the space of a fortnight five of them were dead, and of the other five four were dying. In a standing attitude they were chained to posts, so that they could not move day or night: and in that posture they were deliberately and slowly starved to death" (Canon R. W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, 1878, i., 507).

A strange case was that of Sir Adrian Fortescue, a Knight of St. John. He belonged to an old Devonshire country family, and his mother, Alice Boleyn, was Anne Boleyn's great-aunt. He frequently attended Court, and was present at the festivity of the Field of the Cloth of Gold; but he held no high State offices, being essentially a country "squire." Without any warning, however, on August 29, 1534, he was arrested, but was released after a time. Arrested again in February, 1539, he was condemned by "attainder," for "sedition and refusing allegiance." He was beheaded

on Tower Hill, July 9, 1539; but the strange thing is that no specific charges had been brought against him. "The same attainder, however, went on to decree death against Cardinal Pole and several others because they 'adhered themselves to the Bishop of Rome.' Catholic tradition has always held that Sir Adrian died for the same cause" (*The Catholic Encyclopædia*, 1911, vi., 147).

Glastonbury Abbey, Somersetshire, was the most famous monastery in England. According to legend, it had been founded by Joseph of Arimathea. Though that tradition may be dismissed, it remains a fact that the Abbey dated back to very ancient times, Ina, king of the West Saxons, having founded a church and monastery on the site in the early part of the eighth century. Later, it contained a shrine of St. Dunstan and the reputed tomb of King Arthur. When Henry VIII. set about suppressing the monasteries, the Abbot of Glastonbury was Richard Whiting. He was learned, pious, and discreet, and ruled the abbey well. When Henry VIII.'s commissioners arrived on September 19, 1539, the abbot was arrested and sent to London for examination. A grim entry remains in the autograph *Remembrances* of Thomas Cromwell, the king's vicegerent: "Item: The Abbot of Glaston to be tryed at Glaston and also executyd there with his complycys." Evidently the result was taken for granted! Whiting was sent back to Somersetshire, where, after a mock trial, he and two of his monks (John Thorne and Roger James) were dragged on hurdles to St. Michael's Tower and hanged. Their bodies were decapitated and cut into quarters, the abbot's head being fixed over the gateway of the abbey he had formerly ruled.

Reading Abbey, Berkshire, had been founded by Henry I. in 1121. When Henry VIII.'s process of suppression began, the abbot was Hugh Faringdon (or Cook). The abbot refused to surrender his house to the king; he was therefore proceeded against by "attainder," one result of which was the forfeiting of all property to the king. "So far as [the death of] the aged Abbot of Reading was con-

cerned, it was nothing but a judicial murder; his death was decided upon ere he had been sent down from the Tower [of London] to Reading. Cromwell's notes read that the abbot was 'to be sent down to be tried and executed at Redyng with his complices. Similarly the Abbot of Glaston at Glaston. Counsellors to give evidence against the Abbot of Redyng, Mr. Hynde and the king's attorney. To see that the evidence be well assorted and the indictments well drawn.' According to all current law, Abbot Hugh, a mitred abbot, who had sat in many a Parliament, ought to have been arraigned for high treason before Parliament; but Cromwell set law completely at defiance, and Hugh, with two brother abbots [Glastonbury and Colchester] had been cut to pieces by the common executioner ere Parliament reassembled" (*Victoria History of Berkshire*, 1907, ii., 71-72). Abbot Hugh was hanged, drawn, and quartered—together with two priests, William Eynon and John Rugg, monks of his Order—outside the gateway of his own abbey.

Colchester Abbey, Essex, had been founded in the eleventh century by Eudo, an official of King William Rufus. When Henry VIII.'s suppression-process was in operation, the monks of Colchester were divided in opinion as to the political questions at issue. The abbot, however (Thomas Marshall, also known as John Beche), refused to acknowledge the royal ecclesiastical supremacy. He was imprisoned in the Tower of London, and was then sent back to Colchester to be tried by a Commission, consisting of the Earl of Essex, Sir Christopher Jenny, Sir Thomas Darcye, Sir Giles Capell, Sir John Seynclere, and Sir William Pyrton. He was found guilty and hanged (December 1, 1539). Sir Christopher Jenny, writing to Cromwell, said: "The prisoner after his judgment axed the kyngs highness, yr lordeshippes and my lord chauncellors forgiveness and knowlegid hymself in substaunce to be giltie accordynge to theffect of the indictmente and shewyd hym self to be very penytent, savynge [excepting that] he stoode somewhat in his own conceyte that the subpression of abbeys

should not ſtonde with the lawes of God" (*Letters and Papers of Henry VIII.*, xiv. (2), appendix 45).

One of the moſt tragic of the executions under Henry VIII. was that of the Countess of Salisbury. One of the moſt resolute of the defenders of the Papal jurisdiction againſt Henry was Reginald Pole: afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and Cardinal, in the reign of Mary. He was, however, absent on the Continent, and thus out of reach of the vengeance of the king: who, however, could retaliate on his relatives. Sir Geoffrey Pole, a brother of Reginald, was brought before the royal Council, and this arreſt was followed by that of another brother (Lord Montague), and of their mother, Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, together with those of the Marquis and Marchioness of Exeter and Sir Edward Neville. The countess was the surviving representative of the royal house of Plantagenet, and Henry VIII., amidſt the turmoil of his ſtrife with Rome, feared the possible formation of a hoſtile party. His fears were aided by his wrath at the activities of her son Reginald. At the end of 1539 and beginning of 1540, the arreſted men were arraigned for aiding the efforts of Reginald Pole, the king's enemy beyond the seas. All were found guilty; Sir Geoffrey saved his life by giving information againſt the others, but all those others were beheaded.

The countess remained in prison, and in time the continued activities of her son on the Continent determined the king to wreak on her the vengeance he could not visit upon Reginald. She was interrogated by the Bishop of Ely and the Earl of Southampton, but no incriminating admissions escaped her. The king then had recourse to a bill of attainder againſt her and some others. She was condemned by that means, but was held in prison for over a year. On May 28, 1541, she was brought to execution at Eaſt Smithfield. "In the prison and on the scaffold she maintained the dignity of her rank and descent; and when she was told to lay her head on the block, 'No,' she replied, 'my head never committed treason; if you will

have it, you must take it as you can.' She was held down by force; and, while the executioner performed his office, exclaimed, 'Blessed are they who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake.' Her death, or rather murder, which seemed to have no rational object, proclaimed to the world that the heart of the king was not less steeled against the feelings of relationship and humanity, than it was inaccessible to considerations of justice and honour; and proved an awful admonition to his subjects, that nothing short of unlimited obedience could shield them from the vengeance of their sovereign" (Lingard, *History of England*, v., 62). At the time of her execution, the countess was over seventy years of age.

The reign of Henry's son and successor was a time of chaos. The repudiation of Papal supremacy was continued, but the Protestant party gained power, and Henry's Catholic system of doctrine was upset. Foreign Reformers flocked to England. John à Lasco had under him a congregation of Dutch and German Protestants in London. Italian and French Protestants also had congregations in the same city and at Glastonbury. Similar congregations existed at Sandwich, Bristol, and Ipswich. The political state of the country was confused owing to the king's being a minor and his Council being riven with rival ambitions. In the north and west of the country there was widespread unrest, both political and religious. In 1549 there was a rising in Devonshire, the leaders of which declared, "We will not receive the new service, because it is but like a Christmas game, but we will have our old service of Matins, Mass, Evensong, and Procession in Latin as it was before" (Strype, *Cranmer*, ii., 826). The suppression of this rising caused great bloodshed; but there are no names recorded, during the reign of Edward VI., which have been adopted by the Roman Catholic Church as those of martyrs. Edward's successor, Mary, set in motion the strong Papal reaction whose sanguinary methods have caused her name to be handed down as an evil English tradition. The accession of Elizabeth saw the end of that

reaction; but the policy of her Government was to crush out, if possible, Papal recusancy by the rigorous infliction of penalties other than that of death. The Roman Catholic Church records the name of no martyr in Elizabeth's reign until 1570—eleven years after her accession—and the name of the first martyr is very significant.

John Felton was a gentleman of good family and ample means, a strong partisan of the Papal cause. Pope Pius V. had just issued his Bull, *Regnans in Excelsis*, declaring Elizabeth excommunicated and commanding her subjects to refuse allegiance to her. On Corpus Christi Day, May 25, 1570, a copy of the Bull was found fixed to the door of the Bishop of London's palace in St. Paul's Churchyard. John Felton was arrested on suspicion of having placed it there. Examined under torture, he admitted the offence. He was condemned to death and executed as a traitor. On the scaffold "he denied to the last that he had intended or done the queen any harm—that is, he believed the Bull was for the salvation both of herself and of the kingdom, and he sent her from the scaffold his great diamond ring, though he refused to acknowledge her as queen. (The sending of the ring, however, was partly due to a sporting desire to dish the jackals of the law—and in particular the Lord Chief Justice—who, according to the odd precedents of that time, were claiming it as their prey)" (Rev. J. H. Pollen, S.J., *English Catholics under Elizabeth* p. 153). The significance of Felton's execution is in itself and in its date. He died for publishing a Bull of deposition against the queen, and no Roman Catholic—as such—had been executed in Elizabeth's already eleven years' old reign until Felton died for that clearly treasonable offence. Elizabeth's Government desired to avoid the death penalty, and did not inflict it until after the Bull of Deposition.

Thomas Plumtree, secular priest, was executed at Durham, January 4, 1571. He had been chaplain to the insurgents in the Rising in the North in 1569.

John Storey, Doctor of Law, had been Member of Parliament for Hindon, Wiltshire, and chancellor to Bishop

Bonner in Mary's time. He had retired to Antwerp, but was lured on to a fishing-boat, brought to England, and condemned for having harboured refugee Northern rebels. He was hanged, drawn, and quartered at Tyburn, June 1, 1571.

Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland, was condemned as a chief leader of the Northern Rising. "There is no news in this country which I can relate for certain, except that two earls, those namely of Northumberland and Westmoreland (as I fancy you have heard from hence some days since), whom the queen's majesty ordered, in the month of December last, to appear before her honourable council (to clear themselves from a suspicion of a conspiracy premeditated by them against the religion and doctrine proved by the holy scriptures, and established by the authority of our most serene queen at least ten years since), have raised a rebellion ; and together with some of the queen's subjects, inhabitants of the bishopric of Durham (over which Bishop Pilkington presides), whom they had jointly stirred up to battle, they most impiously took up arms" (a contemporary, hostile view : letter of R. Hilles, London, to H. Bullinger at Zurich ; *Zurich Letters*, number cxliii.). The Earl was beheaded at York, August 22, 1572.

In 1574 the "seminary priests" began to arrive. William Allen (afterwards Cardinal), ex-principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and who had gone to the Continent, founded at Douai in 1568 a college—and in 1579 another at Rome—to train priests to go on mission to England. Priests, especially Jesuits, began to come over in considerable numbers, and of course the Government regarded this as a grave, urgent menace, both as threatening the stability of the new settlement of religion and as (by reason of the Deposing Bull) involving a probable danger to the Crown itself. The seminary priests were relentlessly sought out. They arrived in disguises and used false names and other methods of concealment. They were regarded as essentially an invading army. John Nelson, Jesuit—born at Skelton, Yorkshire, and educated at Douai—was executed

at Tyburn, February 3, 1578. Thomas Sherwood, student, born in London, was arrested on his way to Douai; was condemned for refusing the oath of supremacy, and executed at Tyburn, February 7, 1578.

In 1580 Fathers Parsons and Campion began their English mission; they are the most celebrated of the Elizabethan Jesuits, and were a great problem to Elizabeth's Government. Campion was born in London, educated at the Bluecoat School, conformed for a time to the Established Church, became a scholar and fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and was a man of high culture and spirituality. He returned to the Roman Catholic Church, went to Douai, became a Jesuit at Rome in 1573, and was sent on the English mission in June, 1580. His spirit was as seen in these words of his: "You see now, therefore, Reverend Father, how much need we have of your prayers and sacrifices and other heavenly help, to go through with these things. There will never want in England men that will have care of their own salvation, nor such as will advance other men's. Neither shall this Church here ever fail, so long as priests and pastors shall be found for the sheep, rage man or devil never so much. But the rumour of present peril causeth me here to make an end. Arise God, his enemies avoid. Fare you well" (Letter to Father Alfonzo Agazario, November 17, 1580). Campion's favourite motto was "My soul is in my own hands ever." His mission was exceedingly successful in regaining people to the Roman Church. He was arrested, condemned, and executed (hanging, drawing, and quartering) at Tyburn, December 1, 1581. Campion's comrade had been Robert Parsons (Persons), a man of very different type: a political intriguer and advocate of a Spanish invasion; but he escaped to the Continent, became rector of the English College, Rome, and then went to Spain to further the Armada project. He died at Rome, 1610, and is not in the list of martyrs, as he was not executed. With Campion had been executed Robert Shirwin and Alexander Briant: a secular priest and a Jesuit, both from Douai.

The following priests from abroad (all from Douai except Filby—from Rheims ; Lacey—Rome ; and Thompson—Rheims) were executed in 1582 ; the first at Chelmsford, the next seven at Tyburn, and the others at York: John Payne, Thomas Ford, John Shert, Robert Johnson, William Filby, Luke Kirby, Laurence Richardson, Thomas Cottam, William Lacey, Richard Kirkman, James Thompson. In that year a very drastic Government campaign against the recusants was conducted in North England under Henry, Earl of Huntingdon, Lord President of the North.

Two Douai priests were executed at York in 1583 : William Hart and Richard Thirkeld ; and two laymen, both schoolmasters (John Slade and John Bodey) were also executed : Slade at Winchester, Bodey at Andover.

In 1584 Lord Burleigh published his official defence of the Government, *The Execution of Justice in England* ; a reply to it—*A Modest Defence of English Catholiques*—was published from the Continent by Cardinal Allen, who, in his treatise, denounced the Elizabethan measures while defending those of her predecessor, Mary. The following were executed in that year : Laymen—William Carter (for printing "Popish" books), John Finch (for harbouring priests), Richard Gwyn, or White (executed at Wrexham for being reconciled to the Roman Church ; he was the first Welsh martyr) ; Priests—George Haydock, James Fenn, Thomas Hemerford, John Nutter, John Munden, James Bell. Bell was a survivor of the clergy of Mary's days, and was condemned for being reconciled to Rome ; the others were all seminarists from Rheims, except Hemerford : from English College, Rome.

In 1585 was enacted the statute making it high treason for any Jesuit or other seminarist to be in the realm at all, and felony for anyone to receive or relieve one. Most of the martyrs of the next hundred years suffered under that Act. Many priests were banished, only to return. From then to the end of 1587 the following seminarists were executed : Thomas Alfield, Edward Stransham, and

Nicholas Woodfen (Douai and Rheims); Hugh Taylor, Richard Sergeant, William Thomson, Robert Anderton, William Marsden, Francis Ingleby, John Finglow, John Sandys, John Adams, Robert Dibdale, Thomas Pilchard, Edmund Sykes, Stephen Rowsham, John Hambley, and Alexander Crowe (all Rheims); John Lowe (Douai and Rome). All were condemned, under the 1585 Act, for being foreign-ordained priests come to England. One secular priest (George Douglas, a Scotsman who had settled in Rutland as a schoolmaster; he is thought to have been formerly a Franciscan friar) was hanged, drawn, and quartered at York—September 9, 1587—for refusing the oath of supremacy. Thomas Webley, a layman, was executed at Tyburn—July 6, 1585—for circulating Allen's *Defence*; Marmaduke Bowes, a gentleman, at York, November 26 of the same year, for harbouring a priest; Robert Bickerdike, gentleman, at York—July 23, 1586—for a treasonable speech; Richard Langley, gentleman, at York—December 1 of the same year—for harbouring priests; and, at York on March 25, 1586, had been carried out the excessively tragic and pathetic death of Margaret Clitheroe (*née* Middleton).

She had been born at York in 1553, her father being sheriff there. Her parents conformed to the Reformed Church. In 1571 she married a rich butcher named Clitheroe, and in the following year she was reconciled to the Roman faith. She was arrested several times; but, in the intervals at which she was at liberty, she sheltered priests. She kept a private chapel at the house of Little Shambles. This was raided, and Margaret arrested. She was accused of harbouring priests, and refused to plead: since, by so doing, she would implicate others. For that refusal she was sentenced to be pressed to death. The execution took place on the date mentioned above. "She knelt upon the ground, and the women put the linen garment on her. When all was ready, the sheriff ordered the door to be put upon her. Her hands were tied to posts, one on each side. Under her back was put the sharp stone.

. . . Then four men came in bearing the heavy stone weights, and laid them on the door. 'Bring more weight,' said the sheriff, and as, with frightful violence, they hurled them on the door, Margaret's bones gave way. She gasped out piteously, 'Jesu, Jesu, Jesu, help me, Blessed Jesu, I suffer this for Thy sake.' The blood poured from under the door. Margaret's face, convulsed with agony, still pleaded for dispatch. 'Bring more stones,' said the sheriff in a husky voice. They piled more stones upon her, and still the eyes moved. The women, shrieking, ran to the gates of the prison, and entreated the men to be quick. She was a quarter of an hour dying; then—'Jesu, Jesu, Jesu, have mercy upon me,' and all was still" (Rev. A. B. Gurdon, *Ven. Margaret Clitherow*, p. 23).

A much-misunderstood incident of Margaret's death was her saying, when the clergyman offered to pray with her, "I will not pray with you, and you shall not pray with me; neither will I say Amen to your prayers, nor shall you to mine." Margaret was simply expressing, with abrupt emphasis, the Roman Catholic refusal to join in prayers with people of other religions.

On February 8, 1587, Mary Queen of the Scots was beheaded; in July of the following year the Armada was destroyed, and a severe series of prosecutions of recusants followed. From then till October, 1591, the executions were: *Rheims priests* (all condemned, under the 1585 Act, for being foreign-ordained priests): Nicholas Garlick, Robert Ludlam, William Dean, William Gunter, Thomas Holford, James Claxton, William Way, Robert Wilcox, Edward Campion, Ralph Crockett, John Robinson, William Hartley, John Hewett, Edward Burden, John Amias, Robert Dalby, George Nicholls, Richard Yaxley, William Spenser, Francis Dickinson, Miles Gerard, Edward Jones, Anthony Middleton, Edmund Duke, Richard Hill, John Hogg, John Holiday, Robert Thorpe, George Beesley, Robert Dickinson; *Douai priests:* Richard Simpson and Montford Scott; *Rheims and Rome priests:* Robert Morton, Richard Leigh, Christopher Buxton, Edward James,

Christopher Bayles ; *Laymen :* Henry Webley (for harbouring the Rheims priest, William Dean), Hugh More (for being reconciled to Rome) ; Edward Shelley, Richard Martin, Richard Flower (for harbouring priests) ; Robert Widmerpool (for aiding a priest) ; John Roche (with a gentlewoman, Margaret Ward ; for rescuing a priest) ; Robert Sutton (1588), and Laurence Humphries (1591) (for reconciliation to Rome) ; William Lamply (for " pursuading to Popery ") ; Thomas Belston and Humphrey Pritchard (for assisting the Rheims priests, Nicholls and Yaxley) ; Robert Hadsty (for relieving the Rheims priest Spenser ; Nicholas Horner, Alexander Blake (both March 4, 1590 : Horner at Smithfield, Blake at Gray's Inn Lane ; for aiding priests) ; Thomas Watkinson, Ralph Milner (1591 ; for a like offence).

After a royal proclamation against recusants, in 1591, and an Act (1593) for better discovering such, the Government's stringency became even severer. These were the *Rheims priests* executed from October, 1593, till the death of the Queen : Edmund Jennings and Polydore Plasden (1591) ; William Patterson (1592) ; Edward Waterson, James Byrde, Anthony Page, William Davis (1593) ; William Harrington, John Boste, Edward Osbaldiston (1594) ; Alexander Rawlins, William Freeman (1595) ; Peter Snow and Christopher Robinson (1598) ; Christopher Wharton, Robert Nutter, and Thomas Palaser (1600) ; John Pybushe, Mark Barkworth, Robert Filcock, Thurston Hunter (1601) ; James Harrison (1602). *Rheims and Rome priests* in the same period : Eustace White (1591) ; Thomas Pormort and Joseph Lambton (1592) ; John Cornelius and John Ingram (1594) ; Robert Southwell (1595). *Douai priests :* William Andlebie, Richard Horner, Thomas Sprott, Francis Page (1597, 1598, 1600, 1602). *Rome priest :* John Jones (1598). Priests educated in *Spain* : Thomas Hunt (1600) ; Robert Middleton (1601), William Richardson (1603). The *laymen* executed were ; Swithun Wells (London, December, 1591 ; for aiding the priest Jennings) ; Brian Lacey, John Mason, Sidney Hodgson

(Tyburn, December, 1591; for aiding the priests White and Plasden); William Pyke (December, 1591; for being reconciled to Rome); Roger Aston (1592; for aiding priests); John Speed, Thomas Bosgrave, John Cary, Patrick Salmon (1594; for a like offence in each case); George Swallowell (1594; for reconciliation to Rome); George Errington, William Knight, William Gibson (1596; for "pursuading to Popery"); Edward Folthorp (1597; for reconciliation to Rome); Henry Abbot and Thomas Warcop (1591; for aiding priests); John Britten (1598; for a treasonable speech); Ralph Grimston (1598; for aiding priests); John Lyon and John Dowdall (1599; for refusing the oath of supremacy); John Rigby (1600; for being reconciled to Rome); John Norton and John Talbot (1600; for aiding priests); Nicholas Tichborne (1601; for a like offence); Anthony Bates (1602; for a like offence); James Duckett (1602; for circulating treasonable literature). Anne Lyne, a woman of gentle birth, was hanged at Tyburn, on February 27, 1601, for being reconciled and aiding priests.

The case of Robert Southwell, mentioned amongst the foregoing names, was very striking. Born in Norfolk in 1560, he grew up to develop eminently beautiful poetic talents, his best poems being *The Triumphs over Death* and *The Epistle of Comfort*. In 1584, after being trained at Douai, he arrived on the English mission. He was arrested in 1592 and imprisoned for three years. He then wrote to the queen's minister, Cecil, asking to be tried so as to end his suspense. "If he is in haste to hang," Cecil is stated to have remarked, "he shall have his desire." He was tried at Westminster on February 20, 1595, condemned, and hanged, drawn, and quartered the next day at Tyburn.

In the Roman Catholic Church's list of Elizabethan martyrs is the name of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel. He refused to conform to the Established Church; endeavoured to leave the country, but was arrested and sent to the Tower of London; he was sentenced to life-

imprisonment, but, some years after, was tried for high treason and condemned; his life was spared, however (1585), and he lingered in the Tower till his death on October 19, 1595. Speaking, a few days before his death, to the lieutenant of the Tower, he said: "You must think, Mr. Lieutenant, that when a prisoner comes hither to this Tower, that he bringeth sorrow with him. Oh, then, do not add affliction to affliction; there is no man whatsoever that thinketh him to stand surest, but he may fall. It is a very inhuman part to tread on him, whom misfortune hath cast down. Your commission is only to keep me with safety, not to kill with severity. Remember, good Mr. Lieutenant, that God, who with his finger turneth the unstable wheel of this variable world, can in a revolution of a few days bring you to be a prisoner also, and to be kept in the same place, where you now keep others. There is no calamity that men are subject unto, but you may also taste as well as any other man. Farewell, Mr. Lieutenant; for the time of my small abode here, come to me whenever you please, and you shall be heartily welcome as my friend" (Lingard, *History of England*, vi., 360).

Although the Roman Catholics had entertained hopes that the reign of James I. would see some relief of their trials, it became an even more troublous period in many respects. The fines were enforced more relentlessly, and in the first year an Act was passed for the severer execution of the anti-Jesuit laws. John Sugar, Douai priest, was executed at Warwick in July, and, with him, a layman named Grissold. In the same summer another layman, Lawrence Bailey, was hanged at Lancaster. In 1605 three laymen were hanged: Welborn and Fultherine at York, and William Browne at Ripon. In the following year the Powder Treason resulted in further executions; three priests (Flathers, Gervase, and the Jesuit, Garnet) were hanged in 1608; four (Cadwallader, Napier, Somers, and Roberts) in 1610; three (Scott, Newport, and Almond) in 1612; in 1615, the Jesuit, John Ogilvie; in 1616, four

priests (Atkinson, Thules, Maxfield, and Tunstall) and a layman, Roger Wrenno; in 1618, the priest William Southern.

Under Charles I., from 1625 to 1649, twenty-two priests and two laymen were executed. Of the priests, the most celebrated is Edmund Arrowsmith, Jesuit. Born at Haydock, in Lancashire, he went to Douai and was sent to the English mission. He was extremely successful in "pursuading to Popery," and was hanged, drawn, and quartered for that offence and for being a foreign-ordained priest (executed at Lancaster, August, 1628).

Under the Commonwealth there were two executions which the Roman Church records as those of martyrs: Peter Wright (Jesuit) and John Southworth (secular priest), 1651 and 1654.

Charles II.'s reign witnessed the brutal panics arising from Titus Oates' "Popish Plot." The executions in this reign, which the Roman Church records as those of martyrs, number twenty-five: eleven Jesuits, one Benedictine, three Franciscans, five secular priests, three laymen commoners, Lord Stafford, and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, Oliver Plunket: specially sent from Ireland for trial.

Such is the tragic list of Roman Catholic martyrs in England from Henry VIII. to James II. Well might Lecky say, of the penal laws, thus: "These laws, among many other provisions, compelled every Catholic to attend the Anglican service; suppressed absolutely, and under crushing penalties, the celebration of the Mass; proscribed the whole Catholic priesthood; and made it high treason for any English priest from beyond the sea to come to England, for any Catholic graduate to refuse for the third time the oath of supremacy, for any Protestant to become a Catholic, or for any Catholic to convert a Protestant. Had such laws been rigorously enforced they must have led to a general Catholic emigration, or have dyed every scaffold with Popish blood; and, as it was, many Catholics perished in England, to whom it is the merest sophistry

to deny the title of martyrs to their faith" (*England in the Eighteenth Century*, i., 340-341).

It is a terrible and tragic story; but the historian must enquire as to *the causes* of it. In a later chapter this will be done. Meanwhile, we must not forget that there was in England another picture also: that of the 286 people burnt at the stake in the brief period of four years during the reign of Mary.

On December 15, 1929, Pope Pius XI. beatified 136 of the English Roman Catholic martyrs. Beatification is often alluded to as "the stage preceding canonisation"; but this is not technically correct, for it is possible for a canonisation to be decreed without a previous beatification—while, on the other hand, beatification is not necessarily followed by canonisation. However, roughly speaking, we may say beatification is the next stage before canonisation. To quote Addis and Arnold (*Catholic Dictionary*, 1917, p. 115): "There are properly only two recognised degrees of sanctity —that of Blessed [beatification] and that of Saint [canonisation]. (The title 'Venerable' is given to those whose case has passed through the preliminary processes.) At the present time, beatification is nearly always a stage on the road to canonisation; the same rigorous proof of eminent virtue and the working of miracles is demanded in one case as in the other. But whereas the cultus of a canonised Saint belongs to the universal Church, and churches and altars can be erected freely in his or her honour, and images, pictures, or statues of him or her displayed without special permission, in the case of one of the *Blessed* it is otherwise. The honour and veneration which are authorised in their regard are limited and partial; and because the cultus of one of them is permitted to one country, or city, or order, or branch of an order, it does not follow that it should be practised elsewhere; and the attempt to extend it without special permission is condemned."

That limited degree of recognised sanctity is now, therefore, paid, in the English Roman Catholic Church, to 136

of those of its members who died during the times of the penal laws. It will be noted that only about half the reputed martyrs have as yet been judged worthy of beatification: but it does not follow that the others will not be beatified later, or that they are not regarded as martyrs. The beatifications of December, 1929, were:

Secular priests: William Andlebie, Thomas Alfield, John Almond, John Amias, Robert Dalby, Robert Anderton, William Marsden, Edmund Arrowsmith (listed officially as "secular priest, Jesuit"), Christopher Bales (Bayles), James Bell, John Boste, James Claxton, John Cornelius ("secular priest and Jesuit"), Ralph Crockett, Edward James, William Davies, William Dean, Francis Dickenson, Miles Gerard, John Duckett, Roger Dickenson, John Lloyd, James Fenn, Thomas Hemerford, Thomas Maxfield, John Nutter, John Munden, William Freeman, Edmund Genings, Hugh Green, William Gunter, William Harrington, William Hartley, John Hewett, Thomas Holford, John Ingram, Robert Wilcox, Edward Campion, Christopher Buxton, John Ireland, Edward Jones, John Kemble, Richard Leigh, John Lockwood, Edward Catherick, Anthony Middleton, Robert Morton, George Napper (Napier), William Patenson, John Pibush, William Ward, John Plesington, Thomas Reynolds, Thomas Somers, Alexander Rawlins, John Robinson, William Richardson, Richard Newport, John Southworth, Edward Stransham, Thomas Thwing (Thweng), Thomas Tunstal, Edward Waterson, Eustace White, Polydore Plasden, William Way, and Robert Watkinson. *Jesuits:* Ralph Corby, Philip Evans, Thomas Garnet, Thomas Holland, William Ireland, David Lewis, Henry Morse, Edward Oldcorne, Ralph Ashley, Nicholas Owen, Henry Walpole, Robert Southwell, Francis Page, William Harcourt, Thomas Whitbread, John Fenwick, John Gavan, Anthony Turner, Peter Wright. *Benedictine monks:* Mark Barkworth, Edward (Ambrose) Barlow, George Gervase, Thomas Pickering, Philip Powel, Bartholomew (Alban) Roe, John Roberts, William Scott. *Franciscan friars:* John Jones, John Wall. *Friar minim:* Thomas Felton. *Lay-*

men : Henry Abbot, Thomas Waucop, Edward Folthorp, John Finch, James Bird, John Bodey, Edward Coleman, Thomas Bosgrave, John Carey, Patrick Salmon, James Duckett, Ralph Milner, Swithun Wells, David Gunston ("Knight of St. John"), Richard Herst, Philip Howard (Earl of Arundel), William Howard (Viscount Stafford), Laurence Humphrey, William Browne, Robert Widmerpool, Henry Grove, Richard (Edward) Langhorne, Edward Shelley, Richard Martin, Richard Flower, John Roche, Richard Langley, Hugh More, Richard Gwyn (White), John Speed, John Slade, John Rigby, George Swallowell, Thomas Welbourne, Brian Lacey, Sidney Hodgson. *Women :* Anne Lyne, Margaret Clitheroe, Margaret Ward.

Amongst the large number whose cases have been postponed for further investigation were Nicholas Tichborne (layman) and John Ogilvie, the Scottish Jesuit. (John Felton—who was executed in 1570 for publishing Pope Pius V.'s Bull against Queen Elizabeth—was beatified by Pope Leo XIII.) It will also be seen that some of the names vary. Edward Fulthrop, for example, is the same layman whom we have mentioned above as Edward Folthorp. Indeed, there is a good deal of uncertainty about the cases of many of the Roman Catholic martyrs. How could it be otherwise? They had to move about in darkness and disguise, with false names and assumed occupations.

In regard to these martyrs, Cardinal Bourne (*Pastoral Letter to the Diocese of Westminster*, Lent, 1928) said, "There is in the intrinsic nature of these their acts, for which they were condemned and put to death, no trace nor possibility of treason." This is a hard saying! The Queen and Government of the realm lay under the anathema of the Pope, who was commanding subjects to rebel and inciting foreigners to invade the country. How could the Government, thus menaced, regard the emissaries of the menacing power as other than treasonable if they were British subjects? The truth is, the cause of the martyrdoms, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, was the mediæval theory

which regarded visible spiritual autocracy as necessary, and intellectual freedom as evil. That theory was not *Catholic*. It was too narrow. When we say, "The Reformation, Catholicism, and Freedom," we mean by "Catholicism" a progressive faith which loves freedom and does not take refuge in autocracy.

NOTE.—The postponement of the case of John Ogilvie, the Scottish Jesuit, was very brief. He was beatified on December 22, 1929.

CHAPTER III

SCOTLAND

At the period immediately preceding the Reformation, the condition of the Church in Scotland was deplorable. It is necessary to avoid exaggeration on such a subject. Externally, the Church was high in pride of place. Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, quoting an old historian—Russell, *History of the Church in Scotland* (1834)—alludes to his "glowing picture of the state of the country before the Reformation, covered over as it was by a net-work of well-planned institutions, and adorned with magnificent ecclesiastical and monastic buildings, where learning was prized and art encouraged." That ancient framework, it is true, was there, and in so august an edifice much good must have been housed; but the evils were immense. A modern Roman Catholic writer (Hilaire Belloc, *How the Reformation Happened*, 1928, pp. 189-190) says: "The second factor in the Scottish position was the corruption of the Church, which, very bad everywhere throughout Europe in the fifteenth century, had in Scotland reached a degree hardly known elsewhere. . . . No considerable body in Scotland was concerned to suffer for the Faith; but many individuals were ready to die in battle or even in torment to express their hatred of the Church. There were few provinces of Europe, no independent realm, where the practice of religion, in the Lowlands at least, had so sunk. There was no great popular insurrection in Scotland against the decatholicising of the country by the rich, as there were abortive, though violent, risings in England, successful ones in France. The gross abuse of lay encroachment upon Church revenues, of using Church revenues as mere income-producers for the bastards or cadets of the great families, had proceeded further in Scotland than in any

other part of western Christendom. It is astonishing to note to-day, when we are rid of it, how deeply that cancer had then bitten in. All Europe was badly poisoned. But in Scotland it was at the worst."

The remoteness of Scotland from Italy, and thus from the Papacy, might well have been expected to militate against the fullest effects of Roman influence; but such, in the Middle Ages, was far from being the fact. Frequently at strife with her far-greater southern neighbour, England, Scotland felt the need of intervention of the greatest power in Christendom, and the Papal influence benefited accordingly. A few incidents, taken from a very interesting mediæval period, may be quoted in illustration of that.

John XXII., who became Pope in 1316, followed the political movements of his time with the utmost vigilance. He exercised a very marked influence on English and Scottish controversies, as can be seen from what followed after the Battle of Bannockburn had demonstrated the doubtful prospects of success in attempts to beat down the free spirit of the Scots. The fires of hatred still burned, and each side watched for opportunities to injure the other. Edward II. of England, for example, called upon his feudal followers to meet him at Newcastle for an expedition against Scotland in 1316. Nothing, however, came of it, and, returning south, Edward received two legates sent by John XXII.: Cardinals Joselin d'Ossat and Luca de Fieschi. (This was in the first year of the Pope's reign.) The letters, conveyed by the legates, contained exhortations to peace, directed both to Edward of England and to the Scots king and champion, Robert Bruce. The Pope, by his own authority, proclaimed a two-years' truce, as preparatory to a general peace. Edward of England agreed. Bruce, however, refused to receive the Papal letter if it was addressed to him as "The Noble Lord, Robert de Bruce, *Ruler* of Scotland," since this was not a formal recognition of his title of *king*. He declined to be bound by an armistice so long as that recognition was lacking.

Cardinals d'Ossat and Fieschi, returning to London, solemnly proclaimed the truce there, and sent Adam Newton, Guardian of the Friars Minor, to notify its publication to the Scots. As Lingard says (*History of England*, iii., 20): "Newton executed his commission with some art. He obtained a safe-conduct to Old Cambus, where the Scots were employed in making preparations for the siege of Berwick. Bruce refused to see him, or to receive his letters; but Newton took the opportunity to proclaim the truce with a loud voice in the midst of the multitude which surrounded him. He was instantly ordered to depart; his petition for a passport was refused; and before he had gone far he was seized by four men, who robbed him of his letters, stripped him to the skin, and bade him farewell. The friar, however, pursued his way to Berwick, and gloried in having fulfilled the object of his mission."

The Scots attacked Berwick with great determination. Endeavouring to repulse them, the English used a contrivance called a "sow," made to contain soldiers: an anticipation of the modern "tank." However, "the Scots, by hurling lighted combustibles, of which they had a quantity prepared, consumed the materials of the English engine" (*Historians' History of the World*, xxi., 108).

Cardinals d'Ossat and Fieschi excommunicated Bruce for breaking the truce. The war continued, however, and then, Bruce desiring an armistice, the intervention of the Pope was sought. The Parliament of Aberbrothock assembled, and a letter—signed by eight earls and thirty-one barons, and carried by the Scots king's couriers—was sent to Rome. The arguments, by which it defended the dynastic claims of Bruce, certainly were largely such as seem quaint in our days. For example, it based calculations, as to the Scots throne, on the passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites. However, the crucial part of the document was clear: the claim was that the Scots were fighting for liberty, and they would not give in until the last Scot was dead.

The Sovereign Pontiff realised that here was no race easy

to be subdued. He treated Bruce's emissaries well, and also urged upon the English king the need for peace. Edward agreed; a peace congress was planned, but Edward's controversies with his own barons caused delay. At last, in 1322, having gained a temporary ascendancy over those haughty nobles, Edward again took up the Scottish matter. At first he attempted further war, but soon realised the futility of it, and, in 1323, a truce of thirteen years was arranged.

The lesson of such mediæval incidents is that, while in some respects the very isolation and relative weakness of Scotland tended to favour Papal influence while the Papacy was the final court of appeal acknowledged throughout Western Europe, yet that fact would cease to be so were the Papacy's prestige gravely diminished; and, further, the indomitable spirit of the Scots would join in with any wide movement having in it the spirit of independence. "Of all the countries of Europe, Scotland is that wherein the mixture of the races has been most easily effected, and where it has left the fewest traces in the respective situation of the different classes of inhabitants. There were never villeins or peasant serfs in this country, as in England and in France, and the antiquarians have observed that the ancient acts of Scotland offer no example of the sale of the man with the land; that in none are found this form, so usual elsewhere: 'With the buildings, and all the chattels, *labourers*, beasts, ploughs, etc.' From time immemorial, the burghers of the principal towns have sat in the great council of the kings of Scotland, beside the warriors of high rank, who styled themselves, in the Norman manner, knights, barons, earls, and marquises, or retained the ancient Anglo-Danish titles of *thanes* and *lairds*. When it became necessary to defend the country, the various trades' companies marched under their own banners, led by their *burgmaster*. They had their honour to maintain on the field of battle, and their share of glory to win. Old popular ballads, still sung, not long since, in the southern districts of Scotland, celebrate the bravery of the shoemakers of

Selkirk at the famous battle of Flodden, fought and lost, in 1513, by James IV. of Scotland" (Augustin Thierry, *History of Norman Conquest*; Hazlitt's translation, 1847, ii., 303).

At the outbreak of the Reformation, there were in Scotland thirteen episcopal sees, of which St. Andrews and Glasgow were archbishoprics; and one hundred large and small monasteries. Those of Holyrood, Jedburgh, Scone, and St. Andrews, belonged to the Austin Canons; Melrose and Newbattle were Cistercian; Dunfermline, Arbroath, and Lindores were Benedictine; Dryburgh (whose ruins still remain) was Premonstratensian. Beneath the surface of things, however, unrest was seething. "Not only was there a strong Lollard party in Scotland between 1530 and 1540, but several Franciscan and Dominican friars took up warmly the cause of ecclesiastical reform, and preached against abuses and superstitions" (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, 1928, p. 686). Not from such tentative and feeble efforts, however, was to come the great change. Indeed, in 1525 an Act had been passed forbidding the importation of Lutheran books; in the following year the king, James V., had written to Pope Clement VII. protesting a determination to resist every form of heresy; and in 1528 Patrick Hamilton—a commendatory abbot who had taught doctrine considered unorthodox—was burnt at the stake at St. Andrews. "Scottish persecution was half-hearted. Archbishop Beaton let Hamilton know that he wished him to make his escape. Beaton was a connection of the Hamiltons; he did not desire, besides, to incur their feud. Patrick's brother, Sir James (not Sir James Hamilton of Finnart), collected a force for his rescue, but was detained by a storm. Hamilton was tried, defended his opinions by the usual arguments, and was burned on February 29, 1528, in a terrible gale of wind, outside the college of St. Salvator. His punishment was unusually protracted and cruel; his courage was equal to the excellence of his life. The law of the State was executed, the coronation oath was kept, but 'the reek of Mr. Patrick,' blown through the land, infected many, and the thirty years'

struggle began for Protestantism while James V. was only a boy" (Andrew Lang, *History of Scotland* i., 430-431).

Hamilton had been a Lutheran; but the Reformation in Scotland was destined to take a severer form than that.

The early history of John Knox is obscure, but he was born in 1505, probably at Morham, near Haddington. He went to Glasgow University in 1522, but nothing is known of his history after he left there (1523) till 1540. From the last-named year till 1543, however, he was a notary, "by Apostolic [Papal] authority." In 1545, however, he had come under the influence of George Wishart, who in that year was burnt for heresy. Meanwhile, King James V. had died (1542; shortly after the defeat of the Scots at the battle of Solway Moss), leaving an infant daughter, Mary Stuart, to inherit his crown.

The year after Wishart's death, Archbishop Beaton was murdered, and Knox was preaching thoroughgoing Protestantism. "What to others was chiefly a promise of personal salvation became for the indomitable will of Knox an assurance also of victory, even in this world, over embattled forces of ancient wrong. It is certain at least that from this date he never changed and scarcely even varied his public course" (A. T. Innes, art. on Knox, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1911, xv., 879). In 1547 he was captured by the French fleet which compelled the surrender of St. Andrews, and was sent to the Loire galleys. He was released after two years, and (Edward VI. of England then reigning) became a preacher in England. He was offered a bishopric, but declined. At the accession of Mary Tudor, he fled to the Continent, where he became a pastor. He visited Scotland in 1555, and preached at Edinburgh. About the end of 1557, the Protestant section of the Scottish nobility had formed a covenant under the name "Lords of the Congregation," and Knox though he had returned to Europe) was their chief adviser. The Scottish Government made efforts to come to some agreement, on a basis of compromise, between the Protestants and Roman Catholics; but it failed, and in 1559 Knox was back preaching Pro-

testantism. At St. Andrews and Perth the mob, stirred up by his oratory, sacked the monasteries. Edinburgh itself, the capital of the kingdom, was divided in tendency, and each party was allowed liberty. Knox took advantage of this to preach incessantly.

In August, 1560, a Protestant confession of faith, drafted by Knox and three companions, was read before the Parliament, approved, and made the basis of an Act abolishing Papal jurisdiction, one repealing old heresy laws, and a third inflicting heavy penalties—death for a third conviction—on those who celebrated, or assisted at, Mass.

We may here give a sketch which will illustrate the temper of those times. On March 31, 1562, there appeared before the Edinburgh bailies a courteous-mannered man, who set before them a plea concerning the preaching of John Knox. He was Ninian Winzet. Ninian, a descendant of Glasgow landowners, was a scholar, priest, and, until ejected in 1561 for refusing to accept the new religious laws, had been Provost of Linlithgow Collegiate Church. After the ejection, he betook himself to the vicinity of the Court of Mary, the queen, and engaged in polemics against the Protestants. He wrote treatises on the points at issue, and collected them into *The Buke of Four Scoir Three Questions*. In May, 1562, he published *Certain Tractatis for Reformatioun of Doctryne and Maneris set furth at the Desyre and in the Name of the afflicted Catholikis of inferiour Ordour of Clergie and Layit Men in Scotland*. These writings show that, though adhering to the "Old Faith," he was by no means of a purely conservative turn of mind, but was wishful for a reform of abuses. In July, 1562, he issued a pamphlet, *The Last Blast of the Trompet of Goddis VVorde againis the vsurpit auctorite of Johne Knox*. He therein engaged in the verbal warfare of the accepted style of vehemence. At that time, he was a chaplain to the queen.

His appearance before the bailies at the end of March had been to appeal against one of Knox's denunciations of the feast of Easter. Winzet appealed to the authority of St. Augustine as to the antiquity of Easter observance.

Moreover, he continued, if Easter be rejected because it rests on Church tradition, how keep the Sunday, which has a similar basis? Winzet also challenged, with biting sarcasm, the nature and reality of Knox's vocation to the ministry. However, the bailies refused his appeal to them to order Knox to reply "in writing."

In September Ninian was exiled. He went to Antwerp, where, in 1563, he published a translation of the *Commonitorium* of Vincent of Lerins. His mind, however, still dwelt on his Scottish controversies. From Antwerp and Louvain he published the aforementioned *Buke of Four Scoir Three Questions*. He was very proud of writing in the vernacular, and of being a patriotic Scot. In 1571 he came to England, but later on went to Douai. In 1577 Pope Gregory XIII. appointed him Abbot of the Benedictines at Ratisbon. Here his abilities and ardour made themselves notably manifest. He revived the seminary, and, under his guidance, it became again famous. He died on September 21, 1592, and was interred in his monastery. Zealous in controversy, yet he was also a naturally gentle-hearted and kindly man. In his life we see an excellent example of the best type of Scottish upholders of the old order of things.

The three parliamentary Acts, already mentioned, against the ancient Church system, had not received the royal assent at the time.

"How," asked Mr. Andrew Lang (*History of Scotland*, ii., 88), "did the Catholics take their new fortunes? Unhappily we know very little on the subject. The country must have seeemed strangely desolate to souls of the old faith. The familiar shrines were vacant of their saints. 'The blessed mutter of the Mass' was silent: the candles were extinguished, the vestments were cut up for doublets, the last incense-smoke had rolled away. In lonely green cleughs of Ettrickdale the chapels were desecrated; the crosses by the wayside had perished; the Angelus no longer called to prayer; the tombs were stripped and spoiled. If all these things had exercised their ministry in stimulating, and consoling, and regulating, the religious emotions; if

the extreme rites of the Church had fortified men in the hour of death—the souls that desired them starved. How much misery this caused we know not, and cannot know. Religious ardour is seldom very common in the world, and perhaps the majority of both sexes who possessed the religious temperament were earnest Protestants. Of the fervent Catholics, lay or clerical, many emigrated, and not a few became distinguished in foreign colleges. The populace most resented the abolition of ecclesiastical holidays: that, probably, was what chiefly galled. Of the clergy, most abjured, and one monk of seventy seized the occasion to marry. The other priests dressed as laymen: the few religious who were left wandered about in secular costume."

The confession of faith, as approved by the Parliament in 1562, consisted of twenty-five chapters, defining theology on a Calvinistic basis, and organising the Church anew under the control of superintendents. On December 20, 1560, the reformed clergy met in Edinburgh: the first General Assembly. "On the twenty-seventh of December, it was agreed to petition parliament to punish as idolaters certain persons who celebrated Mass, or were present at its celebration. The individuals named resided in Nithsdale, Galloway, Kyle, Carrick, Cunningham, Ettrick Forest, East Lothian, and Fife; and among them were the Earls of Eglinton and Cassillis, the Abbot of Crossraguel, and the Prior of Whithorn. It is stated that Mass was openly said in the parish churches of Maybole, Girvan, Kirk-Oswald, and Dailly" (George Grub, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, 1861, ii., 101).

In the Convention of the Estates, May, 1561, an Act was passed for demolishing such abbey-churches and cloisters as yet remained. The carrying-out of this Act was entrusted to the Earls of Arran, Argyll, and Glencairn in the west; to the Prior of St. Andrews in the north; to other commissioners elsewhere. Monasteries were destroyed at Paisley, Failford, Kilwinning, and Crossraguel. "Under colour of this Act, a miserable devastation ensued

of all churches without distinction, the multitude readily following the example which had been given them by persons in authority. The buildings themselves were destroyed; their whole furniture, the holy vessels, the bells, and whatever else could be made gain of, were sold; books and registers were burned; and even the graves of the dead did not escape violation. It was probably at this time that St. Andrews, and the other churches in the midland counties, which had formerly escaped, or only been partially injured, were entirely ruined. The Act could not be strictly enforced in the remote provinces of the north and west, where some of the great nobles yet maintained the ancient ritual" (Grub, ii., 102-103).

Nevertheless, Pope Pius IV. appointed William Chisholm Bishop of Dunblane on June 2, 1861: a mere "paper" appointment, for, although the old bishops still survived, they were powerless to exercise their authority.

After the dissolution of the 1560 Parliament, envoys were sent to the King (Francis II.) of France, who was the husband of Mary of Scotland. A change came, however, for the French King died, and Mary returned to Scotland in August, 1561. Her policy was to accept the state of affairs as existing, but to insist on freedom of worship for herself. This is not the place wherein to sketch the reign of Mary Stuart, tragic and fascinating though the story is. It is sufficiently well known both historically and in romance; moreover, this work is concerned only with matters of liberty of conscience, not with general history. Mary Stuart's career, on its political side, may be summed up thus: As a Roman Catholic, her position was impossible in Scotland, both to herself and to the dominant Protestant party; as a rival to Elizabeth of England, and as a centre of religio-political intrigue, she was in an equally intolerable position when, after her abdication, the coronation of her infant son as James VI. (afterwards James I. of England also), her defeat at Langside and flight to England, she became a captive of the English queen. Mary, Queen of the Scots, was, in her

tragic career and death, a victim of circumstances—*and of ambition?* (" Scotland was, doubtless, in Mary's mind, a mere stepping-stone to England. There the Catholic party was strong but for its lack of a leader, and to the English Catholics Mary seemed their rightful queen. By one way or other—by a Spanish marriage, by the consent of Elizabeth to recognise Mary as her heir, by the ambitions of her own nobles and the wit of Letherington, ever anxious to unite the island under one sovereign—Mary hoped to wear the three crowns. Catholicism she would restore if she could, but that was not her first object" : *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1911, art. by Andrew Lang, " Scotland ").

A century of strife began when, in 1572, the State forced the Kirk to accept bishops. " This was the beginning of sorrows for more than a century. The kirk Presbyterian was founded on the Genevan model, and was intended to be a theocracy. She had claimed, since the riots in Perth in 1559, the Power of the Keys, with the power of excommunicating even the king, a sentence practically equivalent to outlawry. These pretensions were incompatible with the freedom of the State and of individuals. It became the policy of the crown to check the preachers by means of the order of bishops " (Lang, *ibid.*).

These bishops were neither Catholic prelates on the ancient model, nor Protestant superintendents on the Calvinist theory. They were, in fact, simply a State device to keep the Kirk in control. " They dispossessed the Catholics of all Church lands which they held, afforded patrons of benefices a legal method of impoverishing the Church and enriching the Crown, and virtually established the worst form of episcopacy. Results were immediate. The vacant sees were speedily filled with unsuitable persons, puerile, senile, ignorant, incapable, or immoral. ' These Bishops,' says Calderwood, ' were called " Tulchan Bishops." A Tulchan is a calf's skin stuffed with straw, to caus the kow give milke. For the lords gott the benefices, and presented such a man as would be content with the least commoditie, and sett the rest in fewes, tacks, pensions, to

them or theirs' " (J. K. Hewison, *The Covenanters*, 1908, i., 78). Yet, in fairness, one must recognise that, the Kirk making claims as great as Papal, some form of check was inevitable.

In 1580-81 came the first National Covenant. It was produced by the fears aroused, and the anger kindled, by the progress of the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation in Europe, the retreat of Protestantism, the invasions of the seminary priests in England, the oppressions of the " Tulchan bishops " in Scotland, and the invasions of disguised Roman Catholic priests in that country also. The Covenant of 1581 was drawn up by James Craig, and denounced the Pope and the Roman Catholic doctrines in drastic terms. It was adopted by the General Assembly, accepted by James VI., and commanded to be signed by all and sundry. It was renewed in 1590 and 1596. In 1637, after Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, had made his futile efforts to force episcopacy again on Scotland, the Covenant was again made a rallying standard. At a great meeting in the Greyfriars' churchyard, Edinburgh, February 28, 1638, it was solemnly taken, and an oath subscribed against any innovations in religion. The Covenant was accepted by the General Assembly and by Parliament. In 1643, during the civil war in England, the parliamentary party, needing the help of a Scottish army, agreed to accept the Covenant for England and Ireland ; but during Cromwell's Protectorate the attempt failed. Charles II., when he landed in Scotland and was crowned at Scone, swore to maintain the Covenant ; but, once firmly seated on the English throne, he ignored the oath. In 1661 an oath was imposed by Parliament : " I acknowledge my said Soverane only supream Governor of this Kingdom over all persons and in all causes . . ., and shall never decline his Majesties Power and Jurisdiction, as I shall answer to God." " Here in a moment was a *coup d'état* which patriots, Parliamentmen, and pastors did not expect. . . . They then demanded the insertion of the word 'civil' before 'supream authority,' but Melville, Cassillis, and another member

from Ayrshire failed to get this qualification inserted. . . . In this way, Charles II. became Pope of Scotland—a Hildebrand, with no vestige of religion, however" (Hewison, ii., 80). On May 27, 1661, the Duke of Argyll was beheaded, blessing God, pardoning men, glorying in the Reformation, and declaring the Covenant heaven-inspired. Guthrie and Govan were executed in June: James Guthrie, chaplain to Monroe's regiment, and Lieutenant William Govan. A striking case was that of Samuel Rutherford, an aged enthusiast, the author of *Lex Rex*. He was summoned for trial for publishing treasonable literature, but, being bedridden, could not appear. The old man died with the threats of his enemies in his ears. "As Rutherford's end drew near, he seems to have become exalted in the ecstasy of his spirit into Paradise itself, where he beheld the same wonders that the apostle had no words to describe on earth—the veil, the glory, the Bread of Life, the angelic choir. 'Glory shines in Immanuel's Land,' he exclaimed shortly before 'he gave up the ghost, and the renowned eagle took its flight unto the mountains of spices,' on 29th March, 1661. He was buried next day. In his death Rutherford offered the best illustration of his own book on *The Trial and Triumph of Faith*, 1645. Twelve days before he passed, he emitted his manifesto: *A Testimony to the Covenanted Work of the Reformation in Britain and Ireland from* 1638 *to* 1649" (Hewison, ii., 95). The struggle of Covenanters against Crown went on. In 1677 Scotland was under martial law. On May 3, 1679, Archbishop Sharp was assassinated by the Insurgents. In 1685 James VII. (II. of England) was proclaimed; but his flight in 1688 led to the final Protestant settlement. Thereafter, there was no need for any Covenant, but still a few extremists continued passively to repudiate the settlement and to regard the legislative adoption of the Covenant as a State duty.

It will have been seen that the Reformation struggle in Scotland differed in important respects from that in England. It was a popular movement, against the Crown,

in origin; whereas in England it was monarchical and the populace at first merely *acquiesced*—so far as *theology* is concerned—though there can be no doubt that the resistance to the Pope's temporal claims was thoroughly popular. In Scotland there were no long lists of Roman Catholic martyrs, for there was little zeal for the old faith. The martyrs were extreme *Protestants*: yet, in essence, the cause for which they died was the same as that for which the "Popish recusants" died in England—the claim of a Church to dominate, by Divine Right, the State.

In 1612 two Jesuit missioners, Moffatt and Ogilvie, were arrested. Moffatt was imprisoned for a time, then banished; but the other was condemned as a traitor for failing to give satisfactory replies in regard to the Papal deposing-power. He was hanged, drawn, and quartered in 1615. "However, it is only just to the General Assembly to say that they appear to have been averse from shedding blood, especially after experience had proved that modes of persecution which just stopped short of killing were far more effectual than death itself. Banishment from Scotland, with threat of death or perpetual imprisonment in case of return, was the usual penalty both for priests and laymen. Being joined to a greater or less confiscation of property, and rigorously carried out year after year, this policy of banishment brought the Catholic party to a state of extreme weakness and distress" (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, 1928, p. 765).

Yet it was in a country so emphatically Protestant—Protestant not by royal coercion from above, but definitely from the will of its people—that James VII. (II. of England) endeavoured to do as he was endeavouring to do in England—namely, to promote Roman Catholicism by the use of his prerogative. "Perth and Melford went back to Edinburgh, the real heads of the Government of their country. Another member of the Scottish Privy Council, Alexander Stuart, Earl of Murray, the descendant and heir of the Regent, abjured the religion of which his illustrious ancestor had been the foremost champion, and declared

himself a member of the Church of Rome. . . . Royal letters came down authorising Papists to hold offices without taking the test. The clergy were strictly charged not to reflect on the Roman Catholic religion in their discourses. The Chancellor took on himself to send the macers of the Privy Council round to the few printers and booksellers who could then be found in Edinburgh, charging them not to publish any work without his license. It was well understood that this order was intended to prevent the circulation of Protestant treatises. . . . A cargo of copes, images, beads, crosses, and censers arrived at Leith, directed to Lord Perth. The importation of such articles had long been considered as illegal; but now the officers of the customs allowed the superstitious garments and trinkets to pass. In a short time it was known that a Popish chapel had been fitted up in the Chancellor's house, and that Mass was regularly said there. The mob rose" (Macaulay, *History of England*, chapter vi.).

It was unlikely that such uses of the prerogative would be tolerated in a country accustomed to the Covenant!

A little must be said on a subject which, though not directly connected with the controversies between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, yet had for a time so tenacious and terrible a hold on the Scottish mind that it is impossible adequately to deal, even in a sketch, with the Reformation in that country unless it be mentioned. Witchcraft for a period infected the mental and spiritual atmosphere as with a plague. The belief in the existence of witches—women who had supernatural powers derived from the devil, to whom they had sold themselves—was common in Europe during the Middle Ages. As late as the seventeenth century, Walburger of Anhalt, in an elaborate treatise on witches, maintained that they could cause disease, lay snares to kill unbaptised infants, and kill their own children and sacrifice them to the devil. He believed that the devil organised "witch-sabbaths." "The first among mediæval writers to notice the witches' Sabbath

was Regino, abbot of Prume, at the beginning of the tenth century; he speaks of 'wicked women,' who say that they attend great meetings by night 'with Diana, the goddess of the pagans,' and do her bidding. . . . A century later, Burchard, bishop of Worms, speaks of women who believed themselves to ride to meetings on different beasts. A Council of Treves (1310) forbade any woman to pretend that she rode by night with Diana or with Herodiana—'*hæc enim dæmoniaca illusio est.*' By Herodiana was meant the daughter of Herodias, whose skill in dancing was supposed to be displayed at these Satanical assemblies. From the fifteenth century date the systematic severities of the Inquisition for witchcraft (*processus de crimine magiæ*, *Hexenprozess*). Dominican writers of that age—Nider, Jaquerio, Sprenger, Institor, etc.—defended the process, and asserted the reality of what the witches confessed; but the Franciscans, Cassini and Spina, took the opposite view" (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 872).

It was in Scotland after the Reformation, however, that the witch-madness reached its greatest height. Why should that have been so? A variety of causes contributed to it. The belief, itself, was derived from the Middle Ages, but the mediæval belief in priestly exorcism did not accompany it, so the only elements retained were the evil and retributive ones; the severe Calvinistic theology emphasised the effects of sin; and the excited Covenanting spirit reacted on the whole outlook of the people.

In order to induce confessions, suspected witches were deprived of sleep. Iron collars were used to chain them to walls in an erect position. "Instruments were so constructed that, by means of a hoop which passed over the head, a piece of iron having four points or prongs was forcibly thrust into the mouth, two of these being directed to the tongue and palate, the others pointing outwards to each cheek. This infernal machine was secured by a padlock. At the back of the collar was fixed a ring by which to attach the witch to a staple in the wall of her cell. Thus equipped, and night and day waked and watched by

some skilful person appointed by her inquisitors, the unhappy creature, after a few days of such discipline, maddened by the misery of her forlorn and helpless state, would be rendered fit for confessing anything" (Pitcairn, *Criminal Trials of Scotland*, vol. i., part ii., p. 50). In 1661 fourteen commissions were issued for trials of supposed witches. "One traveller casually notices having seen nine women burning together at Leith in 1664 [and], in 1678, nine others were condemned in a single day" (Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, chapter i.).

The difference in psychology, circumstances, and development, between the Reformation in Scotland as compared with that in England, was vital, and must be realised thoroughly. In Scotland, the movement started rather from below—from the people—than from above, and was opposed, at first, to the Crown; its theology was logical and severe; it had no Catholic elements in the historic meaning of that term; and it was more intolerant in doctrine than in England. The English Reformation was begun by the Crown; its theology was of a compromising type, aiming at comprehending different schools of thought; the framework of the ancient ecclesiastical hierarchy was retained, with a liturgy based on mediæval models, and a Catholic tradition—varying in power at different periods, but never altogether forgotten—was retained. Finally, the fierce intolerance, whether against Puritans or against "Popish recusants," was always more political than doctrinal. Doctrine was a factor, but the political aspect was dominant. It is true, the English Anti-seminarist Act of 1585 made it treason for *a priest* to come from abroad into England; but the reason the Government fastened on the mere fact of priesthood, was not because it was intolerant in doctrine as such, but because priesthood—ordination abroad—was the one vital thing by which it could identify the enemies it sought.

CHAPTER IV

IRELAND

No estimate of the facts of the long and terrible struggle between Irish Roman Catholicism and the Protestant ascendancy can possibly be adequate which merely begins at the beginning of the Reformation. We have to go back to a far remoter past: for the struggle was mainly racial. Religious hatreds were violent. Penal laws were directed nominally against a proscribed religious creed. None the less, the vital element was *race*, and the struggle goes back long generations anterior to the Reformation.

The Celtic Churches, whether in Britain or in Hibernia, were never within the scope of the Roman Empire in the degree to which others were. Britain, it is true, was a conquered Roman province. The Christian faith, therefore, would seem to have been more likely to have come here from Rome than from elsewhere. Yet we must remember that, during by far the greater part of the period of Roman domination of Britain, the Empire was not Christian, but pagan. Julius Cæsar came here 54 B.C.; the Roman authority was finally withdrawn A.D. 411; Christianity was proclaimed a legal religion, in the Empire, only A.D. 312. That is, the time during which Britain was under a *pagan* Roman Empire, compared with that during which it was under a tolerant, or professedly Christian, one, was as about 400 to 100. The Roman power, then, during the greater part of its duration, tended not so much to propagate Christianity as to oppose it. Christianity, then, would, previously to 312, have been introduced into any country, not with official Imperial aid, but by voluntary emissaries, who may have come as much from elsewhere than Rome as from Rome. There is, of course, the story, told in the Venerable

Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, of the British King, Lucius, appealing to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, for missionaries; but it is probably a legend and in any case is dubious. British bishops were at the Councils of Arles (A.D. 314) and Sardica (343 ?); but that proves little in days when the centralised prestige of the Roman See was in its infancy.

When Gregory the Great sent to Britain the mission of Augustine, it came to the court of a King who represented a conquering, invading race. It came to the Kentish Saxons. They were the conquering, deadly foes of the Britons. The bitterness of the hatred of the two races was extreme. To give some illustrations: "*Anno* 457.—This year Hengist and Æse his son fought against the Britons at the place which is called Crecgansford [Crayford], and there slew four thousand men; and the Britons then forsook Kent, and in great terror fled to London." "*Anno* 491.—This year Ælla and Cissa besieged Andredscester, and slew all that dwelt therein, so that not a single Briton was there left." "*Anno* 519.—This year Cerdic and Synric obtained the kingdom of the West Saxons; and the same year they fought against the Britons where it is now named Cerdicsford. And from that time forth the royal offspring of the West Saxons reigned." "*Anno* 552.—This year Cynric fought against the Britons at the place which is called Searo-byrig [Old Sarum], and he put the Britons to flight. . . . And Ethelbert, the son of Ermenric, was born; and in the thirtieth year of his reign he received baptism, the first of the kings in Britain." This was the Ethelbert whom Augustine converted. (Quotations from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.)

The scene was of Britons constantly and bitterly resisting invading Saxons, who, however, prevailed; of a Saxon power becoming firmly enthroned in Kent; and of Augustine converting its king. Yet the strife of Britons and Saxons continued. Augustine came in 596; yet we read: "*Anno* 682 [nearly a century later]—In this year Kentwin drove the Britons to the sea." "*Anno* 661.—. . . Wulfhere, the

son of Penda, laid waste Wight, and gave the people of Wight to Ethelwald, king of the South Saxons, because Wulfhere had been his sponsor at baptism. And Eappa, the mass-priest, by the command of Wilfrid and King Wulfhere, was the first of men who brought baptism to the people of the Isle of Wight."

In 605, "Laurentius [Augustine's successor] and his fellow bishops wrote a letter to the priests of the Britons, suitable to his rank, by which he endeavoured to confirm them in Catholic unity; but what he gained by so doing the present times still declare" (Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, book ii., chapter iv.). The Council of Whitby (664) decided the dispute in a sense favourable to Roman contentions; but "Colman, perceiving that his doctrine was rejected, and his sect despised, took with him such as would not comply with the Catholic Easter and the tonsure (for there was much controversy about those also), and went back into Scotland" (Bede, book iii., chapter xxvi.). A gradual reconciliation of the two parties went on: "Wilfrid, also being made a bishop, came into Britain. . . . The Catholic institutions daily gained strength, and all the Scots that dwelt in England either conformed to these, or returned into their own country" (Bede, book iii., chapter xxviii.). Yet even in Bede's own times (about 716), "The Britons, who would not acquaint the English with the knowledge of the Christian faith, now, when the English people enjoy the true faith, and are thoroughly instructed in its rules, continue inveterate in their errors" (Bede, book v., chapter xxii.).

If Celtic Britain persisted so long in independent tendencies, both racial and religious, how much more so the distant Hibernia! The founding of an organised Church in Ireland was due to St. Patrick, a native of Bonavem of Taberniae (? Kilpatrick, Scotland). He was taken to Ireland and sold as a slave, but escaped, and eventually went to the Continent. He had visions urging him to be a missionary of Christianity; returned to Scotland, where he was ordained, and then went to Ireland. He was exceedingly

successful in converting that then pagan land, and fixed his bishopric at Armagh.

The early Irish Church was essentially monastic, and was celebrated for its piety and learning. It sent missionaries to Burgundy, Germany, and the Netherlands. Until the eleventh century it was independent of Rome, though many efforts had been made to subject it to Papal authority. In 1155, however, Adrian IV. (Nicholas Breakspear, the only Pope of English birth) authorised Henry II. of England to invade Ireland. "Learning had declined, and Christianity shared the common moral degradation. The national Church was in schism from the Church of Rome, both as to the observance of Easter and in permitting the marriage of the secular clergy—indeed, the marriage bond was of the loosest. Henry II. was too astute a personage to fail to take advantage of this degeneration; dismal accounts of the heretical condition of the Irish Church reached England through the Danish settlers, who, acknowledging the supremacy of Rome, received their orders not from the Irish but the English archbishop. So, armed with an account of Irish heresy, Henry sought the papal sanction to invade the island. In those days the Pope was commonly held to be the suzerain of all islands, and acting on this prerogative Adrian IV. issued a Bull authorising Henry to undertake the conquest 'to enlarge the bounds of the Church, to restrain the progress of vices, to correct the manners of the people, to plant virtue and to increase the Christian religion, to subject the people to laws, to extirpate vicious customs, and to enforce the payment of Peter's pence'" (W. S. Gregg, *Irish History*, 1886, pp. 19-20).

The execution of this Bull was, however, delayed by Henry's wars on the Continent, and it was not till after some of Henry's Anglo-Norman warrior-lords had begun an invasion (at request of an Irish chief who desired their aid against a rival) on their own behalf, that Henry turned his attention definitely to Ireland. He then went to Ireland with an army and obtained the nominal submission of most of the chiefs; but in reality the English power was

confined to the district on the eastern coast (the Pale) wherein their armies were predominant. Within the Pale, Anglo-Norman feudal law prevailed; elsewhere, the traditional Irish Brehon laws.

The racial struggles of Ireland and England date from these Norman invasions. The Anglo-Normans regarded the Irish as an inferior race. "All that remained of Irish population within the inclosure of the Pale was soon confounded in one common servitude, no distinction remaining between the friend of the foreigners and the man who had resisted them; all became equal in the eyes of the conquerors, as soon as the latter no longer needed assistance. In the kingdom of Leinster, as elsewhere, they only left to the inhabitants such of their land and property as was not worth taking from them. They who had called in the Normans and fought with them repented and revolted; but wanting organisation, they could not carry on their revolt" (A. Thierry, *Norman Conquest*, ii., 190).

There is a strange, deep historic irony in the long struggles of Ireland and England, for their beginnings were largely caused by that very same Papal power whose creed has been associated with them ever since; but, since the Reformation, on the opposite side. "She [Ireland], whose misfortunes were in a degree caused by the ambition of the Popes, attached herself to the doctrines of Popery with a sort of fury, the instant that England emancipated herself from them" (Thierry, ii., 197-198).

It was, then, to a land divided between an Irish native race regarded as inferior, and an English ascendancy, that the news came of Henry VIII.'s repudiation of the Papal jurisdiction. The Irish Parliament assembled in 1536, and passed—in spite of opposition from the primate and many other clergy—Acts abolishing Papal jurisdiction, forbidding appeals to Rome, prohibiting Peter's pence, and granting the Church-dues of first-fruits to the king. In 1543 Cromer, the primate, died; the king appointed Dowdall as his successor, but the Pope designated Waucop.

Dowdall, however, had possession. Monasteries were suppressed. There was, during Henry VIII.'s reign, no change of theological doctrine, except as regards the Papal headship, but images and relics were removed from the churches, the Creed, Commandments, and *Paternoster* were inscribed on the walls. A "form of beads" (prayers), issued by Brown, Archbishop of Dublin, was badly received in some places. Archbishop Brown, a native of England and formerly an Augustinian canon, was zealous in removing images, relics, etc., and in promoting acceptance of the royal supremacy over the Church. "It has often been observed that no blood was shed in Ireland on account of religion during the whole of the reign of Henry VIII. This fact, however, does not prove that a tolerant spirit now predominated. It rather indicates that there was at this time in the country very little enlightened and earnest Protestantism. We have no evidence that, at the death of this monarch, there was even one intelligent professor of the reformed faith in all Ulster, Connaught, or Munster" (W. D. Killen, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, i., 353).

In Edward VI.'s time, the English liturgy was established in the churches, the First Book of Homilies ordered to be read on Sundays, an Order of Communion (in which communion under both kinds was given) circulated—to be used *as well as* the Mass. A synod of the Church assembled, by royal command, on March 1, 1551. Edward VI.'s First Prayer Book was adopted (the primate, Dowdall, opposing), and was used for the first time in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, on Easter Day, 1553.

After Mary Tudor had reconciled her kingdoms to Rome, Pope Paul IV. sent a Bull confirming to her and her husband, Philip, the title, King of Ireland, which Henry VIII. had assumed to himself. During Mary's brief reign, however, the tragic events which occurred in England were not reproduced in Ireland. The authorities followed, as regards proclamations, the model of those in England. They proclaimed Lady Jane Grey as queen, but, on her execution, they as readily proclaimed Mary. The reformed

liturgy was discontinued in the churches. When the Irish Parliament met, it modelled its statutes on those of England. The Papal jurisdiction was again recognised, and the ancient church services restored. The laws against heresy—including the penalty of burning—were re-enacted; but no one was burnt: there were few Protestants, and no zealous ones. An Act was passed providing that no Parliament should be called till the reasons for calling it, and the Bills to be placed before it, had been considered and approved by the Sovereign.

In January, 1559, the first Irish Parliament under Elizabeth assembled. Now was to begin the long, tragic, horrible religio-racial struggle which was to continue for 360 years. Mary's Acts of reconciliation with Rome were repealed. The Act of Uniformity was passed, requiring the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. to be used in the churches. An Act was also passed investing in the Crown the power to appoint bishops. "Thus by the decision of the Parliament of Ireland did the ancient National Church of Ireland assert her independence of Papal control, and, under the sanction of the same authority, cast off the errors and superstitions which had clouded her ancient faith, and corrupted the purity of her primitive doctrines" (J. Macbeth, *Story of Ireland and her Church*, 1899, p. 166—a Church of Ireland view).

As to the degree to which the bishops conformed or otherwise to the new order of things, it seems that the Archbishop of Dublin (Curwen) did so, as did O'Fihel, Bishop of Leighlin; the conduct of four bishops (Ossory, Ferns, Cork, and Clonfert) was uncertain; while the rest of the hierarchy—the Archbishops of Cashel and Tuam (that of Armagh was vacant), two bishops holding sees in the Pale (and whom the Government ejected from their positions), and sixteen other bishops—refused conformity. As these bishops died, or as, in the course of the Elizabethan wars in Ireland, the Government was able to extend the area in which its will prevailed, the cathedrals, church lands, and other endowments, were put into

possession of bishops and clergymen accepting the Reformed order. Nevertheless, the Pope continued to appoint bishops; and this is one vital respect in which the history of the Reformation in Ireland differs from that in England and in Scotland. "The episcopal succession [in Ireland] . . . presents to us two hierarchical chains of a completely different character, both of which may be traced to the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth. The Romish, as well as the Anglican, Church has maintained to this day a line of prelates in Ireland. If the Marian bishops possessed what has been called apostolic succession, those of them who remained in communion with the Church of Rome could transmit it to their successors in as much purity as those who, merely for the sake of preserving their emoluments, consented to conform" (Killen, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, i., 384). "The Pope, too, had organised a complete Roman Catholic hierarchy; regularly appointing, as vacancies fell, archbishops and suffragans to all the Irish sees" (C. G. Walpole, *Short History of Kingdom of Ireland*, p. 174). The Bishop of Aghadoe was at the Council of Trent; as also was Archbishop Waucop of Armagh. They were supported there at the Pope's cost, and Waucop advocated sending Jesuit missioners to Ireland.

Now began the long series of wars between Elizabeth's Government and the Irish people. It is necessary to appreciate all the factors involved. Ireland was legally a part of Elizabeth's dominions. It had become so, however, by inheritance from the Norman conquests, and the racial hatreds continued. Irish chiefs held by feudal right from the English Crown as being also the Crown of Ireland; but they were Irish, and rebellions were frequent. The religious conflict was a new complication, and it was fomented from Rome. Thus, English Crown-rights, Irish patriotism, and religious warfare, were all factors in the bitter struggle.

The prohibition of Roman Catholic worship (though the native Irish remained attached to it), and the illegalisation of the ministry of the Roman Catholic clergy, drove

those clergy back on secret ministrations. The friars (Franciscans and Dominicans) "preached the ancient faith in the native tongue upon the bare hill-sides" (Walpole, *Short History of Kingdom of Ireland* p. 111). "For nearly 300 years, since the reign of Queen Mary, no [Roman] Catholic bishop ever lived at Armagh. Primate Dowdall, who lived in that reign, was the last Archbishop who made Armagh his home. Not only were the primates forbidden to reside there, but they dared not, on their visitations to northern parts of the diocese, approach to within three miles of the sacred city" (Rev. J. Gallogly, *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh*, p. 2).

Social conditions in Ireland in Elizabeth's reign were deplorable. The land was ravaged by mutually warring chieftains. Shane O'Neill claimed sovereignty in Ulster; he professed allegiance to Elizabeth, however, and was received by her in London. Soon he re-asserted his Ulster claims, and war ensued. Cavan and Fermanagh counties were devastated, and Armagh Cathedral was sacked. O'Neill was killed (1567) by forces under Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Deputy. Peace resulted in Ulster; but Munster and Connaught were in anarchy through wars of chieftains. The Lord Deputy proceeded thither and imprisoned two of the Geraldine family: the Earl of Desmond and Sir John Fitzgerald. The rebellion, however, was kept up by James Fitzmaurice Geraldine. (It will be noted that these lords had Norman names; they were of the ancestry of the Norman invaders, but had become thoroughly Irishised.) The factor of religious animosity inflamed the conflicts. Fitzgerald at length submitted, was pardoned, and went to the Continent. He came back, however (1579), with soldiers and priests; the Desmonds and Clanricardes joined him, and grievous war followed. The rebellion, however, was subdued.

Elizabeth endeavoured to form colonies of English settlers ("planters") in Munster, but the attempt failed. A rebellion broke out under Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone; but he submitted before the end of Elizabeth's reign.

These wars reduced to confusion most of the organisation of the new settlement of religion; but "within the Pale, and in some of the southern dioceses, the organisation was complete" (Macbeth, *Ireland and her Church*, p. 177). The Protestant sees of Emly and Clonmacnois were united to those of Cashel and Meath respectively.

The truth is that for long periods the jurisdiction of the English monarchs over Ireland was largely nominal. "It was only when the religious quarrels of the sixteenth century became acute that the Tudors—already alarmed at the action of the Irish Parliament in recognising and crowning a pretender in Dublin Castle—found themselves compelled to assert direct kingship. From that time till the legislative Union [1801] every enemy of England could safely count on finding a foothold and active friends in Ireland. It is much too late in the day to indulge in any recriminations on this score. The issues were the most tremendous that have divided Europe; each side was passionately convinced of the rightness and justice of its cause. . . . In Elizabeth's time the menace was from Spain; Spanish forces twice succeeded in effecting a landing on the Irish coast, and were welcomed by the inhabitants. Spain was then the most powerful enemy of England and of civil and religious liberty all the world over; Elizabeth was declared by the Pope to have forfeited the crown of England, and if the Armada had been successful at sea, the Spanish army in England would have found enthusiastic supporters in Ireland" (J. R. Fisher, in *Against Home Rule*, 1912, p. 48. It must not be assumed that the political or other opinions of writers here quoted are adopted; they are quoted as illustrations as to facts).

In the reign of James I. came the Plantation of Ulster. Small grants of land, taken by forfeiture from the native Irish, were granted to Scottish settlers. The Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell were accused of treasonable dealings; they fled the country, and six whole counties were confiscated and planted with English and Scottish settlers. "The picture drawn of their general character by Stewart, the son

of one of the ministers who came over, is probably a little overcoloured, but there is no reason to doubt its substantial truth, and it does much to explain the ferocious character of the rebellion that followed. 'From Scotland came many, and from England not a few, yet all of them generally the scum of both nations, who from debt, or breaking or fleeing from justice, or seeking shelter, came hither, hoping to be without fear of man's justice, in a land where there was nothing, or but little as yet, of the fear of God. . . . On all hands Atheism increased, and disregard of God; iniquity abounded, with contention, fighting, murder, adultery' " (Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, i., 23). Of course, the idea of any toleration of the Roman Catholic worship was not entertained by the planters. To help to defray the cost of the plantation, the king created the order of " baronets." The Ulster baronets were to bear on their coats of arms a " bloody hand," the badge of the O'Neills (the " red hand of Ulster "). Each new baronet had his title on condition that he maintained thirty soldiers for three years at 8d. a day each : about £1,095 altogether. As the title was to be hereditary, it was sought eagerly.

In plantations in parts of the country other than Ulster, the method adopted was not that of confiscation, but of examination of rights. Persons were sent to examine titles to estates. They discovered flaws on almost any pretext, and the owners either were ejected or had to pay to the king heavy sums to be allowed to remain. A new race of spies called " Discoverers " arose, who gave information of any titles that could be made out to be faulty ; in return for their services, they received either the estate or part of the money paid by the owners to retain possession. It can be imagined what an amount of misery these proceedings produced.

The plantations, however, also added a new complication to the Irish situation. The Scottish settlers were Calvinist Presbyterians, and thus the Established Church had a legal rival in addition to the proscribed but prevalent Roman Catholic Church. The first National Synod of the

Established Church met in 1613, and drew up 104 Articles, Calvinistic in tone, which remained in force till the adoption, in 1635, of the Thirty-Nine Articles. An assembly of the prelates of the Established Church, convened by Archbishop Usher in 1626, declared that "the religion of Papists is superstitious and idolatrous; their faith and doctrine erroneous and heretical; their Church, in respect of both, apostatical; to give them, therefore, a toleration, or to consent that they may freely exercise their religion and profess their faith and doctrine, is a grievous sin." Nevertheless, under James I. some degree of toleration was extended to the legally proscribed creed of the majority. Charles I. was favourable to toleration, but was prevented from carrying his intentions into effect, English opinion being hostile; and then occurred the terrible rising of 1641. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh had convened a provincial synod of his clergy, and it sanctioned the rising as lawful and pious. In May, 1642, a synod of Roman Catholics assembled at Kilkenny, and formed a provisional government for the control of the country until such time as a parliament could be called. The provisional government was to consist of twenty-four members, six for each of the Irish provinces: to be elected by a general assembly of fourteen Roman Catholic peers, the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy, and 226 Roman Catholic deputies from the counties and towns.

The provisional government (convention) met in October, at Kilkenny, and organised an army under four generals: Owen Roe O'Neill for Ulster, Gerald Barry for Munster, Preston for Leinster, and Sir John Bourke for Connaught. By this time the rising was not a mere rebellion, but a civil war. In 1643 (September), a truce was agreed on with Charles I.: a truce which was fatal to the Roman Catholic cause, for disunion at once developed in its ranks. A definite peace was signed on January 17, 1649; but seventeen days later it was invalidated, for the king himself was executed. In August, Cromwell, attended by his son (Henry), and by Ireton and Ludlow, landed with an army

to quell the rebellion. What followed has been known ever since, in Ireland, as "the curse of Cromwell."

He laid siege to Drogheda, and, capturing it, put the inhabitants to the sword. "The enemy had made three entrenchments, both to the right and left of where we entered; all which they were forced to quit. Being thus entered, we refused them quarter; having, the day before, summoned the town [to surrender]. I believe we put to the sword the whole number of the defendants. I do not think thirty of the whole number escaped with their lives. Those that did, are in safe custody for [selling into slavery at] the Barbadoes. . . . This hath been a marvellous great mercy. . . . And truly I believe this bitterness will save much effusion of blood, through the goodness of God" (Oliver Cromwell to Bradshaw, President of the Council of State; see Carlyle, *Cromwell*, letter 104).

"Among the English soldiers who were present at this siege was the brother of Anthony Wood, the well-known historian of Oxford, and the vivid and most authentic glimpse of this episode of Puritan warfare, which that accurate and painstaking writer has given us in his autobiography, furnishes the best commentary on the language of Cromwell. He relates how his brother 'would tell them of the most terrible assaulting and storming of Tredagh [Drogheda], where he himself had been engaged. He told them that 3,000 at least, besides some women and children, were . . . put to the sword. . . . After they had killed all in the church, they went into the vaults underneath, where all the flower and choicest of the women and ladies had hid themselves. One of these, a most handsome virgin arrayed in costly and gorgeous apparel, kneeled down to Thomas Wood with tears and prayers to save her life, and being stricken with profound pity, he took her under his arm, went with her out of the church with intentions to put her over the works to shift for herself, but a soldier perceiving his intentions ran his sword through her, . . . whereupon Mr. Wood, seeing her gasping, took away her

money, jewels, etc., and flung her down over the works'" (Lecky, *Ireland*, i., 145).

On October 10 there was a like scene at Wexford. "The enemy quitted the walls of the town; which our men perceiving, ran violently upon the town with their ladders, and stormed it. And when they were come into the market-place, the enemy making a stiff resistance, our forces brake them, and then put all to the sword that came in their way. Two boatfuls of the enemy attempting to escape, being overprest with numbers, sank; whereby were drowned near three-hundred of them. . . . By an unexpected providence, [God] in His righteous justice, [hath] brought a just judgment upon them; causing *them* to become a prey to the soldier, who, in their piracies, had made preys of so many families, and now with their blood to answer the cruelties which they had exercised upon the lives of divers poor Protestants! . . . The soldiers got a very good booty in this place; and had not they [the Irish] had opportunity to carry their goods over the river, whilst we besieged it, it would have been much more. . . . Thus it hath pleased God to give into your hands this other mercy. For which, as for all, we pray God may have all the glory. Indeed, your instruments are poor and weak, and can do nothing but through believing—and that is the gift of God also" (Cromwell to Speaker Lenthall; Carlyle, *Cromwell*, letter 107).

The result, for the Roman Catholics, of Cromwell's relentless campaign, was a pitiless proscription of their religion. "As the tories [robbers] and the wolves were killed, so were the priests. Proscribed, hunted, and transported as soon as caught, they still hung about the country in all sorts of disguises and in all kinds of hiding-places, performing the offices of their religion in secret and at the peril of their lives" (Walpole, *Short History*, p. 279). The Established Protestant Church was also persecuted, as in England, during the Cromwellian *régime*, and its services were banished from the churches.

It will have been noticed that, in his Drogheda report,

Cromwell said that such few Irish as survived the massacre "are in safe custody for the Barbadoes." They were, in fact, to be slaves. The Irish Roman Catholic bishops, assembling at Clonmacnois on December 4, 1649, declared that the aim of the Puritan invaders was "to root out the inhabitants and plant this land with colonies to be brought hither out of England, as witness the number they have already sent hence for the Tobacco Islands, and put enemies in their places." On April 1 the Council of State had issued a license to Sir John Clotworthy to transport "five hundred natural Irishmen." On September 6 a license was granted to certain merchants "to pass to New England and Virginia, where they intend to carry four hundred Irish children." When the priest, John Grace, visited the West Indies in 1666, he found no less than 12,000 Irish people scattered through the various islands and treated as slaves.

On the return of Charles II. to England, the services of the Established Church were restored in Ireland as in England. The Roman Catholic religion, however, was tolerated in Ireland all through the reign of that king. Oliver Plunket, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, however, was arrested on accusation of engaging in a treasonable plot. As there was no prospect of securing his conviction in Ireland, he was sent to London : then in the fury of panic aroused by Oates's "Popish Plot." Archbishop Plunket was convicted mainly on the strength of evidence derived from the celebrated "Coleman letters." "His [Coleman's] letters formed, as they still form, the weightiest part of the evidence against the Roman Catholic intriguers, and had they not secured his conviction, the Jesuits, Mr. Langhorn, Lord Stafford, and Archbishop Plunket, would have gone unconvicted also. By his [Coleman's] condemnation the way was opened by which they were sent to the scaffold, the innocent and the guilty alike, without favour or discrimination" (J. Pollock, *The Popish Plot*, 1903, p. 304). The Archbishop was hanged, drawn, and quartered at Tyburn, July 11, 1681 ; and he is

reckoned by the Roman Catholic Church in its list of martyrs. He was beatified by Pope Benedict XV. on May 23, 1920.

The accession of James II. naturally gave joy to the Roman Catholic Irish, since he was of their faith. Sir Richard Talbot, a Roman Catholic, was created Earl of Tyrconnell and given command of the army in Ireland. Later he was made Lord Deputy. "His arrival spread dismay through the whole English population [in Ireland]. Clarendon was accompanied, or speedily followed, across St. George's Channel, by a large proportion of the most respectable inhabitants of Dublin, gentlemen, tradesmen, and artificers. It was said that fifteen hundred families emigrated in a few days. The panic was not unreasonable" (Macaulay, *History of England*, chapter vi.). Tyrconnell determinedly promoted James II.'s schemes for replacing the Protestant ascendancy in Ireland by a Roman Catholic one. James, however, lost his throne, and, when he came to Ireland, the battles of Aughrim and the Boyne settled his fate there also. The brief period of triumph for the Roman Catholics was to have a bitter sequel.

By the Treaty of Limerick, October 3, 1691, the promise of liberty of worship, and of oblivion of all past offences, had been made to the Roman Catholics; but the Treaty was not observed by the Government. By an Act of the English Parliament (3 William and Mary, chapter 2, English), Roman Catholics were forbidden to be members of that of Ireland. They were afterwards disfranchised, forbidden to be magistrates or members of municipalities, excluded from the Bar, from the grand juries, and from the vestries. They could not be solicitors, sheriffs, or even hold such humble offices as that of constable. No "Papist" might own a horse of value higher than £5. Roman Catholics were excluded from the University of Dublin. No Roman Catholic could be guardian of a child, nor keep a school. He might not even be a teacher in a school. It was forbidden Roman Catholics even to send their children abroad for education. By 7 William III., chapter 4, a

reward of £10 was offered for any discovery of a Popish schoolmaster. The object of these enactments on education was clearly to reduce the Roman Catholic population to complete ignorance or else to withdraw them wholesale from their religion.

A curious result of those enactments, however, was the formation of "hedge schools." The priests and schoolmasters combined, all over the country, to evade the law. Schools were kept secretly, and at great risks, in mountain glens or in bogs. Rude huts were built to serve for these gatherings. They were generally surrounded with hedges; hence the name. The majority of them were for elementary subjects; but higher studies were pursued in the hedge schools of Munster. These schools, in fact, continued to some extent to exist right down to the calamitous period of the famine of 1847.

"All the great persecutions of history . . . were directed against minorities. It was the distinguishing characteristic of the Irish penal code that its victims constituted at least three-fourths of the nation, and that it was intended to demoralise as well as degrade. . . . It was intended to degrade and impoverish, to destroy in its victims the spring and buoyancy of hope and enterprise, to dig a deep chasm between Catholics and Protestants. . . . It was not the persecution of a sect, but the degradation of a nation" (Lecky, *Ireland*, i., 170).

CHAPTER V

THE ANTECEDENTS: PAPAL MEDIÆVAL POWER

Such long and bitter struggles—such ferocity of mutual destruction—must have originated from some other cause than mere wanton perversity. When great societies of men erect, against other great societies of men, laws of exclusion and persecution, there must be some fear caused by very compelling facts. No doubt, in the wars, persecutions, and hatreds, of Roman Catholics against Protestants, and of Protestants against Roman Catholics, there was much of mere vulgar greed, personal ambition, and sheer wickedness; but those factors cannot explain the essential problem which lies beneath it all. "The issues were the most tremendous that have divided Europe; each side was passionately convinced of the rightness and justice of its cause." What was the chief factor which, distinct from all the lesser ones of mere common wickedness, produced the deadly battles of the Reformation?

I take it to be this: During the Middle Ages, Western Europe was dominated by a theory of society from which it was entirely necessary to break away if intellectual, material, and religious progress was to be made; but that theory was of such a nature that liberation from it was possible only at the cost of deadly and protracted warlike struggles.

The theory was that which, in 1302, was expressed in emphatic words by Pope Boniface VIII. in his Bull *Unam Sanctam*. In order to avoid misunderstanding, it may be well to say a little as to the nature and degree of force of that famous document.

Philip the Fair, King of France, was engaged, during a period of several years, in a bitter conflict with the Papacy

concerning the rights of taxation and other matters as affecting the clergy and the respective jurisdictions of Church and State. Boniface eventually summoned the French prelates to a council in Rome, but Philip prohibited their attendance. Nevertheless, four archbishops, thirty-five bishops, and six abbots, of France, attended, and, after the council, Boniface issued *Unam Sanctam*, following it with a sentence of excommunication against all persons, of whatever degree, who should molest, despoil, or impede those who desired to proceed to, or return from, Rome.

Philip replied by holding an assembly—December 1, 1302—whereat it was enacted that no French subject should leave the kingdom without the royal consent, under pain of imprisonment and forfeiture of goods. The king proceeded to take very high ground when the Pope sent a legate to attempt an accommodation. The attempt failed, and the king published a formal act of accusation against Boniface, citing him to appear at a General Council. Boniface, on his part, contemptuously rejected that demand. Then came the dramatic end. Boniface had retired to Anagni, and was preparing to publish a Bull declaring Philip deposed, when (September 8, 1303) the king's chief councillor, William of Nogaret, at the head of 300 soldiers, burst into the Pope's presence, seized him, and conveyed him to prison. Then Boniface, broken down with his anxieties, died (October 11).

It is needful to exercise great care in forming decisions as to the rights and wrongs of such mediæval struggles. Dante, it is true—who was a contemporary of Boniface—assigns that Pontiff to the Inferno, and, in the *Paradiso* (xxvii., 19-27), puts into the mouth of St. Peter one of the most awful denunciations in the whole *Divina Commedia* : a fearful indictment of Boniface :

" If my colour change, marvel not at it ; for, while I am speaking, thou shalt behold all these their colour change. He who usurps upon the earth my place—my place, my place—which vacant has become before the presence of the Son of God, has of my cemetery made a sewer of blood and stench, whereby the Perverse One, who fell from here, below there is appeased !"—

" Se io mi trascoloro,
Non ti maravigliar ; chè, dicend' io,
Vedrai trascolorar tutti costoro.
Quegli ch' usurpa in terra il luogo mio,
Il luogo mio, il luogo mio che vaca
Nella presenza del Figliuol di Dio,
Fatto ha del cimiterio mio cloaca
Del sangue e della puzza, onde il perverso,
Che cadde di quassù, laggiù si placa."

However, Dante was a bitter Ghibelline, and thus of the political party adverse to Boniface. The truth probably is that " each party was passionately convinced of the rightness and justice of its cause," and that we must not judge the motives of mediæval people by standards differing from theirs. The very fact, however, that those times differed so vitally from ours, is a key to the problem discussed in this chapter : the cause of the penal laws of Reformation times. That cause can be seen by studying the Bull *Unam Sanctam*.

Unam Sanctam is selected not because it was in any way an unusual document. Were that so, it would be useless for the present purpose : for it would not represent the normal Papal view. It is selected because it *did* represent that view. Neither is it selected because Boniface VIII. was specially successful in his efforts to promote that view. On the contrary, he was unsuccessful to a marked degree. " The principles for which he strove were indeed the very same that his predecessors, Gregory VII., Alexander III., Innocent III., Innocent IV., Gregory IX., had illustrated with such marvellous success. But the *times* were not the same " (Rev. W. H. Jervis, *History of the Church of France*, i., 58). The Bull is selected because it proclaimed, in clearest words and on an historic occasion, the political principle of the mediæval Church. It does not matter whether it was " infallible " or not : that is, whether or not it comes within the category that the Vatican Council of 1870 has called " *ex cathedra*." As a fact, one clause of it (but not the one with which we are especially concerned) does so come ; but, infallible or not, the Bull represented the principles on which the mediæval Papacy viewed politics, and by

which Western Europe was dominated so far as the Church could effect such domination. Neither does it matter that Boniface's successor, Benedict XI., "explained" the Bull. He did so only so far as to conciliate France within the principles of the Bull; he did not abandon those principles. The Bull *Unam Sanctam*, then, is a convenient document from which to study the principles from which the Reformation was an endeavour to escape.

After arguing, from the Bible, that there can be only one Shepherd of the faithful, the Bull makes its celebrated declaration concerning the "two swords": "The Gospel teaches us that there are two swords in the hand of the Shepherd—the spiritual sword and the temporal sword. When the apostles said, 'Behold, here are two swords' (that is, in the Church), the Lord did not answer, 'It is too many,' but, 'It is enough.' He who would deny that the temporal sword is in the power of Peter misunderstands the word of the Lord: 'Put up again thy sword into its place.' The two swords, spiritual and temporal, are then in the Church's power; the first to be wielded (*exercendus*) *by* the Church, the other *for* the Church; the first by the priests, the other by kings and soldiers, but at the beck and permission of the priest (*ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis*). Now, the one sword must be under the other, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual."

Of this Bull Cardinal Hergenröther (*Katholische Kirche und Christlicher Staat*; English translation, 1876, ii., 121) said: "Given this principle, it naturally follows as a result that the spiritual power is raised above the civil on account of its superiority; the civil is dependent on the spiritual, is obliged to follow its lead, and perhaps even to be corrected by it. There is no question here of special ordinances for France, but of general principles applicable to all Christian States."

As the temporal power was bound, if it acted rightly, to obey the spiritual power, and as the spiritual power was the Roman Catholic Church, so it followed that Roman canon-law, or canon-law sanctioned by Rome, should be part

of the law of the land: administered, it is true, in separate Church courts, but enforced with the aid of the civil power. So it was in mediæval times, and it was on that principle that, in the penal aspects of the canon law, States were held bound to aid such bodies as the Inquisition. "The duties and powers of inquisitors are minutely laid down in [mediæval and later] canon law, it being always assumed that the civil power will favour, or can be compelled to favour, their proceedings. Thus it is laid down that they 'have power to constrain all magistrates, even secular magistrates, to cause the statutes against heretics to be observed,' and to require them to swear to do so; also that they can 'compel all magistrates and judges to execute their sentences, and these must obey on pain of excommunication'; also that inquisitors in cases of heresy 'can use the secular arm,' and that 'all temporal rulers are bound to obey the inquisitors in causes of faith'" (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 457).

Another consequence of the mediæval theory was the "deposing power of the Pope." As the State was held obliged to obey the Church, and as the Pope was head of the Church, so it followed that the head of the State was to obey the Pope, and, if he did not, then the Pope, if judging it right and expedient so to do, could declare the head of the State deposed. Also, if the head of a State became a heretic, he by that very fact ceased to have any right to rule, for he had separated from the power which he was bound to obey. "During the Middle Ages it was held everywhere in Christian countries with undoubting conviction that princes were amenable on the score of heresy to the ecclesiastical power, and that the Pope as the vicegerent of Christ could lawfully excommunicate, and after excommunication depose, or procure the deposition of, a sovereign who had fallen into heresy. This was no Ultramontane theory, but the common teaching of theologians everywhere" (Addis and Arnold, p. 263).

We conclude, then, that: The mediæval social theory implied the acceptance, by every person, every State, and

every ruler, of one system of dogmatic theology, and their subjection to the laws and penalties imposed in maintenance thereof. No person had a right to dissent from that one system of dogmatic theology, and he or she incurred penalties, ultimately death, if persisting in so doing. No State or ruler had a right to dissent from that one system. If a ruler did so, he lost his right to rule. If a State did so, it was liable to invasion and military conquest. Thus, if men have a right to freedom of belief, Europe had to be liberated from the mediæval theory; but, as the Church claimed that individuals and States could be coerced to remain in agreement with, and obedience to, her, it followed that such liberation could be achieved only by bitter struggle, in which the side desiring liberation defended itself by force : for the side *denying* its right to such liberation would certainly endeavour to bring it back, by force, to obedience. This is the explanation of the terrible penal laws described in preceding pages. Their root-cause is found in the principles of the mediæval Church.

This is not the place to discuss the origin of these extraordinary powers claimed by the Papacy. All that we are here concerned with is what they had become, and the means by which some nations became released from that. As to their origin, however, a few passing remarks may be made.

It is clear that the position of the Roman Bishop in the early Church was different not in degree only, but also, at least in some respects, in *nature*, from what it became in the Middle Ages. In the Middle Ages it was suzerain over kings. In the early Church, although it was held in special honour, it not only was *not* suzerain over kings (that was not possible), but also it was not supreme even over *Churches* as it was later.

The Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) was convoked by the Emperor — Constantine — whose favourite — the Spanish Bishop Hosius—presided, while not only was the Roman Bishop—Silvester—not present, but he was represented only by two priests, who did not even sign first, on his

behalf, in the list of participants in the Council. Moreover (to quote a distinguished Roman Catholic writer: Abbot J. Chapman, *The First Eight Councils and Papal Infallibility*, 1908, pp. 10-11), "Mediæval canon law rightly says that the convocation, the presidency, and the confirmation of ecumenical councils belong to the Pope. . . . Did the Pope solemnly confirm it [Nicæa]? . . . I am inclined to think that no Papal confirmation was ever given." In short, the position of the Roman Bishop in relation to the Nicene Council was such that, if a Council had been held in similar circumstances in the Middle Ages, such Council would have been regarded as invalid: yet Nicæa ranks as one of the greatest—probably the greatest—Councils ever held.

Even in the time of Gregory the Great, A.D. 590, the Roman Bishop was in a position abnormal if claims, which developed later, were true. As another Roman Catholic writer (A. L. Maycock, *The Papacy*, 1928, p. 30) says: "He was still, of course, a subject of the Roman Emperor; his election required confirmation from the Imperial Court of Constantinople."

"It seems to me plain from history," said Cardinal Newman (*Via Media*, 1877, i., 180), "that the Popes from the first considered themselves to have a universal jurisdiction, and against this positive fact the negative fact, that other sees and countries were not clear about it, does not avail. The doctrine doubtless was the subject of a development."

It is unnecessary to say much about the first part of that statement. It is, however, very strange reasoning to say that, if a claimant consistently has maintained his own claim, other evidence, even of positive disproof, can be ignored. Moreover, if the Roman claims were always maintained, it is strange that the crucial opportunity of Nicæa was missed! However, the most important part of Newman's statement is that "the doctrine doubtless was the subject of a development."

That is the truth of the matter. The Roman Empire

was divided into East and West, and the Western Empire collapsed before the invasions of the barbarians. The Roman Bishop assumed the powers of the Cæsars, with sanctions of religion. True, he did not assume them *nominally*, but he assumed them *in reality*. He could not maintain them in the East, where the Emperors continued ; but, in the West, the chaos of the Dark Ages brought him constant accessions of power, which, sanctioned with the awe of religion, transformed him from what, in this respect, he had been in the early Church, and led ultimately to the claims and powers of Popes like Boniface VIII. and Innocent III. Thus originated, and grew, the mediæval social system from the exclusiveness of which nations could liberate themselves only by deadly struggles.

It is needless, and harmful, to view that development from a point of view of hostile or friendly partisanship. It is a matter of objective historical fact, and it would be contrary to rational history to deny or obscure the immense benefits of the process : as, also, it would be irrational to deny or obscure the evil. History is a mingling of good and evil.

There can be no doubt that the process, by which the power of the Roman Bishop was aggrandised, was largely necessary to the struggle of West Europe to form a social system after the barbarian inroads. In 741 the barbarian, Luitprand, invaded the Roman province. The Romans appealed to Pope Zacharias, and, at his demand, Luitprand restored the cities and prisoners he had captured. No sooner, however, had he made peace with Rome, than he attacked Ravenna. The Pope sent envoys, and effected the restoration, by Luitprand, of the cities he had occupied (see *Commentarii Storico-critici di S. Zaccaria Papa*, by Cardinal Bartolini, commentario ii.).

Astulph, King of the Lombards, in the time of Pope Stephen II., Zacharias's successor, invaded the Roman provinces, inflicting heavy sufferings on the people. The Eastern Emperor, Constantine Copronymus, was appealed to, but was unable to offer aid. The Pope appealed to Pepin, King of the Franks, who promised assistance against the

Lombards. In 756 Astulph was killed while hunting, and the Duke of Tuscany attempted to seize his power. Astulph's brother opposed him, but the intervention of the Pope produced a reconciliation. As a result of this and other Papal alliances with the Franks, the Papal temporal power was advanced, but Italy benefited.

When the Holy Roman Empire (which, however, was repudiated by the Eastern Empire) was formed at the coronation of Charlemagne by Pope Leo III. (A.D. 800), that system was established which, though its vicissitudes were great, may be summed up fairly well in words such as these of the Roman Catholic writer, Canon W. Barry (*The Papacy and Modern Times*, p. 20): "The Church and the Empire—an ecclesiastical order with its own courts, jurisdiction, properties, immunities, facing a secular order with its tenures, claims, ambitions; and above each its crowned representative supreme—such is the shape into which Christian society falls during the Middle Ages": though Dr. Barry should have added that "the ecclesiastical order" claimed the right *to exact obedience from* "the secular order."

The zenith of the power of that claim is seen in the reign of Innocent III.: 1198-1216. His far-reaching influence dominated all Europe. Italy itself was in chaos, despoiled by marauding German bands of warriors. There were rival Emperors, and the Pope's intervention in those disputes was a fresh source of power to his See. He intervened in France, in Scotland, in Scandinavia, and in England in the great case of King John. He first excommunicated King John and then absolved him, on condition of that monarch's acknowledging that the kingdom of England was held as a fief of the Holy See. Then the Pope became John's protector against the barons. Innocent annulled Magna Charta, and "a supplementary Bull, of one day's later date, reminded the barons that the suzerainty of England belonged to Rome, and that therefore nothing could be done in England without papal consent" (W. C. McKechnie, *Magna Charta*, 1914, p. 46).

Innocent intervened in the attempts of King Sverri of Norway to effect a "royal supremacy" over the Church there. Archbishop Eirik of Nidaros claimed rights over the *Eigenkirchen* : private churches built or endowed by the king or local lords. In this dispute, custom came into conflict with canon law. Archbishop Eirik appealed to Pope Celestine III., who naturally sided against the king. Sverri was excommunicated, but replied : "I am a king's son and lawfully chosen to this land and realm. I suffered many troubles and worries before I acquired this kingdom, and I will not lose my hold of it because of this ban." Innocent III. was Celestine's successor, and he appealed to King Knut of Denmark "to overthrow the monster who spares only those whom he is powerless to harm," so that "this limb of the devil may not continue his frenzied career in Norway" (Potthast, *Regesta*, i ., 336 and 385-387). The conflict, it is true, was not brought to a decisive end, but the matter is an illustration of the far-reaching ecclesiastical imperialism of Innocent. It is needless to express a view as to the rights and wrongs of that old dispute. It was a case of a strong king against a strong Pope. The point of interest to our present purpose is that, in mediæval times, the appeal from absolutist kings was to an absolutist Pope: not to individual or democratic freedom.

Innocent intervened in marriage controversies of royal houses in France, Leon, and Portugal. He received Aragon as a fief. He promoted an anti-Moorish crusade in Spain. He intervened in Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, Sweden, Finland. He attempted to reunite the Eastern and Western Churches. His promotion of the crusade against the Saracens had a tragic sequel : the capture of the Greek Imperial city, Constantinople, by the Latin crusaders. A frightful pillage ensued, but the capture of the city resulted in the establishment, for about fifty years, of a Latin Empire in the Imperial city. Innocent, at first appalled by the horrors of the pillage, turned the result to the interest of the Latin Church and the Roman See.

Innocent was relentless in the repression of heresy. He

sanctioned the crusade against the Albigensians in Southern France. That crusade was a frightful war of conquest. To quote two Roman Catholic writers (Prof. N. A. Weber, in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, i., 269 ; and Mgr. H. K. Mann, *Lives of the Popes*, xii., 260) : " The crusade now degenerated into a war of conquest, and Innocent III., in spite of his efforts, was powerless to bring the undertaking back to its original purpose " ; and " It is assuredly a pity that the salvation of Christendom should have cost so much blood. But . . . it is very doubtful whether the progress of the anti-Christian and anti-social doctrines of the Albigenses could have been stopped in any other way than by the sword." Did the " end," however, really justify such " means " ? " The inhabitants were massacred without distinction of age or sex, of Catholic or heretic. ' Poor towns,' exclaims a poet, an eye-witness of these calamities, ' how have I formerly seen you, and how I see you now.' From the Garonne to the Mediterranean, the whole country was devastated and subjugated " (A. Thierry, *Norman Conquest*, ii., 261-262). " From that time the classic poetry of the south, and even the language consecrated to it, disappeared from Languedoc, Poitou, Limousin, Auvergne, and Provence. Local dialects, inelegant and incorrect, prevailed in every direction, and soon replaced the literary idiom, the beautiful language of the troubadours " (Thierry, ii., 267). Of course, the defence made for this crusade is that the Albigenses were a pernicious anti-social influence. We must deduct, however, from the charges of their foes; and, in any case, what motive could justify such atrocious methods as were employed ? The underlying truth of the matter is sufficiently clear. Mr. Hilaire Belloc (*Companion to Wells*, p. 95) says : " Had not the Albigensian Crusade been tardily but successfully fought, and had not the Battle of Muret . . . saved European culture, the Albigensians would have swamped us all. At an enormous expense of energy and by a Providential good fortune that disaster was avoided." The " Providential " reminds one of Oliver Cromwell's " this hath been a marvellous great

mercy," after the massacre at Drogheda; but the *meaning*, underlying the Albigensian matter, is plain: Mediæval culture could not tolerate free development of thought, and massacre, if needful, would be used to suppress such freedom.

It is uncertain when the *Inquisition* originated; but Innocent III. set it on a firm footing, though it was not thoroughly organised till, under Gregory IX. in 1229, the Council of Toulouse ordered a tribunal to be erected in every city, consisting of a priest and three laymen, who were charged with the task of seeking out heretics and denouncing them to the bishops. In 1233 Gregory transferred the working of the Inquisition from the bishops to the Dominicans. In 1263 Urban IV. appointed an Inquisitor-general, to whom reference had to be made by subordinates in all doubtful cases.

The prisoners of the Inquisition were never allowed to see the witnesses against them. This rule seems detestable to us, and indeed it *was* detestable; but it has a significance of an important kind. Had trials been open, or even had witnesses been known, the object of the Inquisition would largely have been defeated: for that object was not the punishment of civil crime but the prevention of the spread of freedom of thought. In short, the " hidden " character of Inquisitional methods was a characteristic arising from the exclusivist theory of the mediæval system. Torture was employed to extort confessions; and, when a convicted person was condemned to the fire, the punishment was made an occasion for an imposing public religious display. A procession was formed of the accused, in order of their innocence or guilt: first, the ones found innocent, these wearing their ordinary dress, and separated from the others by a crucifix; then came the effigies of dead heretics, with inscriptions intimating their crimes; and, finally, the condemned, each clad in a yellow garment (*san benito*), decorated with significant emblems. St. Andrew's crosses marked those who had escaped with their lives; red flames those who were threatened with burning if again convicted;

and representations of devils surrounded with flames covered the robes of those who were to suffer death. Thus apparelled, the convicted prisoners were led before the Inquisitor, who, with a profession of reluctance, handed them over to the secular power, and they were burnt.

This procedure also had its characteristic significance. Taking it with the secrecy of the trials, the meaning of the whole Inquisitional theory clearly is that freedom of thought was to be regarded as the worst of crimes: a crime of a peculiarly devilish type; and that both terror and pomp were to be used to impress that idea upon society. The Inquisition was often in conflict with the civil power; but its study supplies a key to the whole theory of the attempted "theocracy" of the Middle Ages.

An ingenious defence has been attempted, of the Inquisition, by Mr. Hilaire Belloc, who says (introduction to *The Inquisition*, by Hoffman Nickerson, 1923, p. 16): "Had you presented to the early thirteenth century the spectacle of the whole male population medically examined, registered, and forcibly drafted into a life [conscribed into the army] where a chance error might be punished immediately by death or by some other terrible punishment . . .; had you sketched for him our universal spy system whereby a strong modern central Government holds down all its subjects as no Government of antiquity, however tyrannical, ever held them down; could you have shown a man of the thirteenth century all this, he would have felt the same repulsion and horror which most modern men feel on reading of the Inquisition, its objects and its methods."

That is to say: *Tu quoque!*—we are in no position to censure the Inquisition! Is not such an argument, however, a decided fallacy? It assumes that, if the "man of the thirteenth century" had had a prevision of our modern evils or restrictions, he would have been seeing something into the evils of which the system in which he himself lived could not have developed. Yet, after all, if we nowadays have, or have had, "examinations," "registrations," "terrible punishments," "spies," etc., the principle

underlying such things is surely not such as would have been abhorred very much by a mediæval polity which involved secret denunciations, secret trials, concealment of witnesses, torture ("the question"), serfdom, feudalism, and the stake! Had Europe's religious unity with Rome remained unbroken, may we not have had, now, not our own evils only, but those evils, or many of them, wedded to an all-pervading spiritual despotism?—a conjunction of forces which would be horrible indeed! The strong words of Lecky (*Rationalism in Europe*, chapter iv.) may be quoted:

"When we recollect that after the mission of Dominic the area of the persecution comprised nearly the whole of Christendom, and that its triumph was in some districts so complete as to destroy every memorial of the contest, the most callous nature must recoil with horror from the spectacle. For these atrocities were not perpetrated in the brief paroxysms of a reign of terror, or by the hands of obscure sectaries, but were inflicted by a triumphant Church, with every circumstance of solemnity and deliberation. . . . What language can describe, and what imagination can conceive, the mental suffering that accompanied it? For in those days the family was divided against itself. . . . It is horrible, it is appalling, to reflect what the mother, the wife, the sister, the daughter, of the heretic must have suffered from this teaching. She saw the body of him who was dearer to her than life, dislocated and writhing and quivering with pain; she watched the slow fire creeping from limb to limb till it had swathed him in a sheet of agony, and when at last the scream of anguish had died away, and the tortured body was at rest, she was told that all this was acceptable to the God she served, and was but a faint image of the sufferings He would inflict through eternity on the dead. Nothing was wanting to give emphasis to the doctrine. It rang from every pulpit. . . . All this was horrible, but it is only a small part of the misery. . . . For, judging by the ordinary measure of human courage, for every man who dared to avow his principles at the stake, there must have

been many who . . . passed their lives in one long series of hypocritical observances and studied falsehoods."

The spirit of the Inquisition, in short, needs to be studied as a main key to understanding that attempted and largely successful "theocracy" which characterised the mediæval social system. It was the spirit which regards the right of a human being to use his mind freely, and to think his own thoughts and proclaim his own ideas, as a deadly and devilish sin, and which would suppress such a right at all costs.

Moreover, the penalty of burning for heresy was inflicted not only by the behest of the Inquisition, but also after trials before the ordinary bishops' courts. It was inflicted in that way in England, as a consequence of the acceptance of Roman canon law in this country. "Frederick II. [the Emperor], 'while still remaining in devotion to the Roman Church,' gave the Popes an opportunity of decreeing the death of heretics, and at the same time of avoiding all ugly phrases. Under what law, then, were the English Lollards burnt? Lyndwood's answer is: Under *Ut inquisitionis negotium*, c. 18 in Sexto, 5, 2. True, you will not find, nor should you expect to find there, any coarse talk of flame and faggot, but you will find there quite enough: the Pope wills that Frederick's constitutions be enforced throughout the world" (F. W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, p. 176).

Then there was the terrible weapon of excommunication for offences other than heresy. "Gradually, as the Church became more powerful or more imperious, excommunications were issued upon every provocation, rather as a weapon of ecclesiastical warfare than with regard to its original intention. . . . These actual penalties [legal disability, deprival of goods, etc.] were attended by marks of abhorrence and ignominy still more calculated to make an impression on ordinary minds. They [the excommunicated] were to be shunned, like men infected with leprosy, by their servants, their friends, and their families" (Hallam, *Middle Ages*, Ward and Lock's complete edition, pp. 427-8).

One instance of the working of this system in England may be quoted (from article, "Excommunication in the Middle Ages," *Quarterly Review*, July, 1928): "In the year 1342, Walter de Spekynton, apparently the son of the Squire of Yeovilton, aided by others, stole crops from the glebe of the vicar of the parish. The plunderer was placed under the ban of excommunication; and from that sentence an ineffectual appeal was made to the Archbishop. To get rid of the excommunication, Spekynton was ordered by Ralph of Shrewsbury, then the Bishop of Bath and Wells, to pay what in modern values would be six hundred pounds to the vicar as compensation. Afterwards, 'for contempt of God and Holy Church,' he was to appear on Epiphany Sunday at High Mass in the parish church of Yeovilton, without shoes on his feet, and wearing only his shirt and breeches. He was to carry a burning candle weighing half a pound. It was in the depth of winter, and as he slowly paced the cold pavement of the unwarmed church, he was forced to endure the stern words of the priest as he explained the penitent's ill conduct to the congregation. Yet that was only the beginning of Spekynton's trials. He had to appear subsequently in the same poor guise and to do penance, on Palm Sunday at Wells Cathedral, on Ascension Day in Bath Abbey, on St. John Baptist's Day in St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol, on the Day of the Translation of St. Thomas Becket at Canterbury Cathedral, on the day of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin at St. Mary's, Taunton, and on All Saints' Day at Somerton. Practically a whole year was thus spent on penances. Even then Spekynton's cup was not full. At the expiration of that time, he had to leave England for three years, which he spent in visiting shrines and places of pilgrimage abroad. In spite of those experiences, Spekynton lived long enough once more to defy the Church and again was excommunicated."

The numbers of such punishments, during centuries and all over Europe, must have been enormous. Of course thieves must be punished; but the point is that, when clerics were the victims of their depredations, the offence

became one for trial in a church court, not in one of the king's courts. By that system, a whole class of people was placed outside the jurisdiction of the civil law: an empire in an empire. That was another evil of the mediæval polity: nations could never be really united, for two independent codes of law operated side by side. If the civil law presumed to lay hands on a clerical offender (and there were five lower orders of clerics besides priests and deacons), even for an offence of a quite non-ecclesiastical kind, the civil law thereby outraged the Church. As a result, although an offence against the Church by a layman would be cried against at once, yet innumerable offences of clerics against laypeople were unpunished. "Not long after the accession of Henry II. [of England], men reckoned up one hundred murders committed by priests who still remained alive and at liberty" (Thierry, *Norman Conquest*, ii., 57).

The Roman Catholic theologians have treated the Papal power, in regard to politics, from three differing points of view. Some regard that power as "direct," others as "indirect," and others as "directive." The first of these theories was little held, and is now held by few or no one. It means, "God has given to the Pope, his Vicar, endowed with the unlimited power of binding and loosing, authority to rule the world in temporal as in spiritual matters, but in such manner that the spiritual power is to be wielded by him in person, while the civil power is to be delivered over to princes" (Hergenröther, *Katholische Kirche*, trans., ii., 205). That is, the civil power is merely the delegate of the Pope. This opinion is not held seriously; probably never was, by any but few at any rate. The "indirect" theory holds (Hergenröther, pp. 208-209) that "the Church has direct spiritual power, but no direct temporal power; . . . [but she must] correct and guide the worldly power, and, if necessary, chastise it when it turns aside from the right path." The "directive" theory is (Hergenröther, p. 227) that "it is the Church's right and duty, by doctrinal decisions, by warnings, declarations, counsels, and commands, to enlighten the consciences of princes and people; . . . and,

in case of a collision of duties, to pass judgment as to what is to be done."

These theories, though differing materially on paper, come to the same thing in practice : the Church, as represented by the Pope, is judge of civil laws so far as they affect faith or morals. The logical consequence of such a theory is that, in a state of society which was modelled on it, acceptance of one system of dogmatic theology would be compulsory on all, and divergence from it would be a crime, entailing drastic punishment or death in the case of an individual, war in the case of a community, and deposition in the case of a ruler.

Of course, even in mediæval times the theory of such domination never worked with precision. There were constant conflicts between Pope, bishops, kings, and other authorities, over matters of jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the idea that it was permissible to hold doctrines, as to religion, contrary to those of the Roman Church, was quite another matter. Heresy was the worst of crimes. For it, the fire or the sword or the dungeon.

We come to this, then : The mediæval social system, as dominated by the Church with the Roman Pontiff at its head, treated freedom of thought as a maximum crime if such freedom ran so far as to oppose the accepted system of dogmatic theology ; and, as those principles of intolerance were enforced by death and war, it followed that the freedom of the European mind could be achieved only after conflicts in which the party of liberation met force with force. That is the main explanation of the anti-Roman penal laws.

Macaulay (*History of England*, chapter i.) said : " Those who hold that the influence of the Church of Rome in the Dark Ages was, on the whole, beneficial to mankind, may yet with perfect consistency regard the Reformation as an inestimable blessing. The leading strings, which preserve and uphold the infant, would impede the full-grown man. . . . The ascendancy of the sacerdotal order was long the ascendancy which naturally and properly belongs to

intellectual superiority. . . . But a change took place. Knowledge gradually spread among laymen. . . . Thenceforward that dominion which, during the Dark Ages, had been, in spite of many abuses, a legitimate and salutary guardianship, became an unjust and noxious tyranny."

In the main, this statement of the case is right; but it needs qualification in some respects and it does not take cognisance of an important factor in the problem. As it is the common view taken of the Middle Ages and the Reformation, it may be well to make a few remarks on it.

Of course, there can be no doubt that it is quite true that "the influence of the Church of Rome in the Dark Ages was, on the whole, beneficial." It restrained, and to some large extent civilised, the barbarians. It moulded communities out of chaos. It kept aloft the light (even though murky often!) of faith and ideality. It preserved learning so far as learning could be preserved in the welter of wars. It produced high saints. Yet the process was mingled with those heartrending enormities of heretic-hunting, and with other evils. Religion was too often made a mere veneer of worldly ambition. The evils were vast, but, "*on the whole*," the influence was necessary to preserve any civilisation at all. It is also true that the Reformation was a casting-aside of "leading strings" no longer needed. But such summaries as that of Macaulay overlook the principal factor in the controversy between mediævalism and the modern world. As the early Reformers themselves generally overlooked it, it is not surprising that others do so.

That principal factor was that the mediæval theory regarded full freedom of thought and expression as positively evil and from the devil. The whole conception of those times was that both individual persons and States must adhere to one commonly accepted code of dogmatic theology, and that any dissent must be suppressed, if needful, by fire and sword. The early Reformers to a great extent—though by no means entirely: for the Elizabethan Government in England was concerned more with the

preservation of the State than with theological problems—were animated with a spirit of intolerant infallibilism akin to Rome's. They were, however, illogical in that, for their break with Rome implied an assertion of the right of private judgment to question and deny a supposedly infallible authority. Thus, the Reformation, even though the Reformers seldom realised it accurately, was the denial of the right of any dogmatic system to dominate society. That is the essence of the problem. Mediævalism regarded full freedom of the mind as devilish. Modern civilisation assumes that it is good and right. The Reformation, then, was not a mere *growth*, but a *reversal*: a denial of the very basis of the mediæval conception;—and of course, the upholders of mediævalism could not, on their own logic, tolerate it. If freedom was to survive, then, it had to be by war. *Sunt lachrymæ rerum*. . . .

CHAPTER VI

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION STRUGGLE

THE human mind perceives things very seldom by "intuition"; knowledge, realisation, and action, come by gradual observation, one fact leading on to another. The life of a nation is the aggregate of the lives of the individuals composing it; so the changes in a nation's life come by degrees. Even in times of revolution there always has been a long preceding process of changes before the revolution takes place.

This was so with regard to the English Reformation. The Roman Catholic faith had become interwoven, during the process of many centuries, with the life of the nation. Early British Christianity had not been Papal: indeed, in these primitive times the Papal power was scarce more than in germ; but, after the coming of Augustine to the Saxons, Latin Christianity displaced, by degrees and by war largely, the early British Church or what remained of it. Even then, there was a great deal of independence in the Church here: it had not separate church courts apart from those of the king, and thus was national rather than Papal: though the Papal influence was considerable. William the Conqueror, however, established the system of separate ecclesiastical courts, and thus brought the Church more definitely under Latin canon law. Even so, however, there were many conflicts. Roman canon law was received as binding. As Dr. Maitland (*Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, p. 44) has said: "Whereas the English State was an independent whole, the English Church was in the eyes of its own judges a dependent fragment whose laws had been imposed upon it from without." That very fact, however, implied possibilities of conflict. The

canon law "had been imposed from without." The free English spirit lay beneath, however; and it produced, in the Church itself, local "customs" which were tolerated by the Latin canon law which could not suppress them. The existence of such local customs does not disprove that Latin canon law was binding; but it does prove that, beneath the surface, there were causes of possible conflict, even in the Church itself. Still more did such causes of conflict exist in the relations between the Church and the State. Writs of prohibition were often sent from the king's courts forbidding the prosecution of causes in the "Courts Christian." True, as Maitland said (p. 74), "Those writs of prohibition against which the clergy protested in their assemblies must often have been drawn by ordained clerks." What, however, does *that* prove? "A man cannot serve two masters." If ordained clergy, bound by canon law, were drawing up royal writs to hinder the working of canon law, that meant that, beneath—even, at times, above—the surface, there were deep causes of conflict, not only between Church and State, but between clergy and clergy. In fact, the germs of the Royal Supremacy were there: and, when a crisis should come, some clergy would be found on the side of the Crown and others on the side of the Pope. Causes were always latent which, if some great anti-Papal movement arose in Europe, would be likely to result in a break between England and the Papacy.

It has been argued (as by Mr. Hilaire Belloc, *How the Reformation Happened*, p. 90 *et seq.*) that Henry VIII.'s break with Rome was an "accident": "an event not desired by its agents; not understood by those who suffered it; coming by no design, but as the prodigious effect of comparatively small and quite incongruous causes." This, however, is a very crude view. Of course, "accident" plays a large part in history. It may be called an "accident" that Luther came to that state of mind which caused him to defy the Pope; that James II. was obstinate and arbitrary; that gold mines were found on the Rand; that the Austrian Archduke was assassinated in 1914. Does it follow, then,

that there were no deep causes of the Reformation; of the 1688 Revolution; of the Boer War; or of the War of 1914-1918? By no means! The particular incidents, which were the immediate causes of those events at a given time, may not have existed, and yet the deep underlying causes would have led to similar results, if not at that exact time, yet at *some* time. Long anterior to the Reformation, there had been in England deep causes of quarrel—and, indeed, there had been quarrels—between Church and State, and between England and Rome. When, then, a great anti-Papal conflict arose in Europe, it was no mere "accident" that England should take sides, and should side with the progressive party. The particular occasion of its doing so would have been an "accident," but some other "accident" might have occurred if that special one had not. Of course, if a feeling of deep, inveterate attachment to the Papal power had existed here, England would not have taken the anti-Papal side; but such deep, inveterate attachment did not characterise the English people.

The theological doctrines of Latin Christianity, of course, were intertwined with English life, and so were the pious practices (pilgrimages, etc.) arising therefrom. To take but one instance: the Festival of Corpus Christi. Established in the middle of the thirteenth century by Pope Urban IV. as a feast of the Universal Church, this festival in honour of Transubstantiation soon became one of the popular annual events in the Latin Church. It became a yearly gala-day in England. Each Guild had its place and banner in the processions which formed a striking feature of the rejoicings. Long after the Reformation, a curious survival of such processions was to be found in London. The Skinners' Company (formerly the Guild of Corpus Christi of Skinners) continued to walk in solemn procession, on the Thursday after Trinity Sunday, from its hall on Dowgate Hill to St. Antholin's Church, Watling Street, and "children strewed flowers before them [as before the Host carried in the monstrance], only knowing that this was an ancient custom." Every pre-Reformation parish

church had its Corpus Christi processions. Starting from some small church, if such existed, the procession would pass along the chief streets to the cathedral or other principal church. Children strewed flowers and rushes along the way. The mayor and other prominent folk had leading places. Every effort was used to make the function as beautiful as possible. For example, in the will of William Bruges, Garter King at Arms (1450), was a bequest of "a most rich feretory of wood gilt and jewelled silver" as a "solempnitie of array for the fest of Corpus Christi" (see Peck's *Annals of Stamford*). Similar gifts were frequent.

Then, however, came the Reformation in Europe. What side was England to take, or was she to be neutral? Hardly neutral! No land could have been neutral. Naturally, then, the English Government was conservative at first; for the ancient system was one of which it formed part, and no direct English interest was assailed at first. Then, however, came the great question of the king's divorce. It can hardly be denied that Henry VIII.'s quarrel with the Pope arose at first from his own personal desires, and from no lofty or far-planned national projects. A step once taken, however, other aspects are soon perceived. The very first great move of the king's (his casting the clergy in a Præmunire) was based on old statutes which implied little less than a Royal Supremacy. Even when the clergy, in acknowledging the Royal supremacy, inserted the futile "saving clause," *quantum per legem Christi licet*, they showed the weakness of the position. Who was to judge "how far the law of Christ allowed"? All over Christendom there was doubt about Papal powers. "As to whether the Papacy were a necessary centre of unity, whether civilian rulers and the Churches of their various realms and districts might not be organised without submission to it, there was a divided attitude, with chances *against* (for the moment) a majority's supporting the full Papal claim" (Belloc, *How the Reformation Happened*, p. 141). The causes of this doubtfulness were many: the Great Schism of the West, the Council of Constance's claim to be superior to Popes,

the evils in the Church and the Papacy, and the doubts cast on Papal credentials by "the new learning"; but, anyway, the Papacy was doubted. Then, when the English Crown found itself challenged by the Pope, and when it realised the weapons placed in its own hands by previous Acts of Præmunire, it resolved (after hesitation) that the Papal jurisdiction was not binding at all. It threw it off. It was a great but quite logical act when the previous history of England was collated with the pressing circumstances of the time and the prevailing doubts of Papal claims. Once entered upon, however, that repudiation could be successful only if the Crown ruled with a high hand. The Royal Supremacy over the Church had to be, for the time, absolute; and *the monasteries* had to go.

As to the monasteries, this may be said: "First, the monks and their monasteries had long survived their use. They were out of touch with the national life, and they had retarded its progress [of late years]. They were a burden on the land, and they were the last owners to free their serfs. . . . Besides the populace, the bishops and parish clergy were no friends to the monks or friars. The exemption of the monasteries [from episcopal control] had been a serious aggression, by the Pope, on the old authority of bishops. The acquisition of patronage and livings by the monks was a grievous wrong to the parish clergy, and to their parishioners. . . . Moreover, besides the injuries to the diocesan and parochial systems, besides all the money the Orders exported to Rome, the monks and friars themselves were a Papal army of occupation; supported by the Pope, and supporting him in turn; opposed, therefore, to all reform, especially of the Pope's authority; and willing, in defence of it, to set the kingdom in a blaze, by allying themselves either with rebels or invaders" (Rev. A. Galton, *The Message and Position of the Church of England*, 1899, pp. 107-109).

So, the Royal Supremacy having been asserted, it was inevitable that the monasteries should go. The process of their going was grim. The year 1535, indeed, may be

called one of the grimmest in our history. In April the king proceeded against the Carthusians, who were executed as has been described in a former chapter. To pave the way to the total suppression of the monasteries, the pulpits up and down the land were used against them. "Preachers were, moreover, commissioned to go over the country in the early autumn, in order, by their invectives, to educate public opinion against the monks. These pulpit orators were of three sorts: (1) 'railers,' who declaimed against the religious as 'hypocrites, sorcerers, and idle drones, etc.'; (2) 'preachers,' who said the monks 'made the land unprofitable'; and (3) those who told the people that, 'if the abbeys were down, the king would never want any taxes again'" (Gasquet, in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, x., 455).

Meanwhile, the executions of More and Fisher had been accomplished. England lay under absolutism, with Thomas Cromwell as the king's chief minister. The suppression of the monasteries was undertaken in grim earnest. "In the later summer, Dr. Richard Layton and Dr. Thomas Legh, both of whom had been instrumental in getting evidence against More and Fisher in the Tower, having accompanied Thomas Cromwell into the west of England, obtained from him, as the king's vicegerent in spiritual matters, powers to make a circuit and visit the monasteries of the kingdom generally" (Ollard and Crosse, *Dictionary of English Church History*, 1919, p. 371).

The horrors of the suppression have been told often. "England, free heretofore, and free hereafter, was passing through an interval of slavery. . . . The realm was divided into districts apportioned to a set of creatures whose obscure names are not all known to this day. Their commissions for their important work were not under the Great Seal, but only under the king's hand and signet. But, obscure as they may be, they wrought a greater change in English society than the greatest hero or the mightiest poet that ever fought or sung; and the names of Dr. Bedyl, Dr. Layton, Dr. Legh, Dr. London, Dr. Petre, Robert

Southwell, Richard Southwell, John Gage, Elias Price, John Ap Rice, Richard Bellasis, William Hendle, and all others that can be recovered from the gulf of time ought to be held in everlasting remembrance. As soon as they were appointed they sped; and before the year had ended the monasteries began to fall beneath their hands" (Canon Dixon, *History of the Church of England* i., 307).

The economic effect was grave; but one must take a just historic view. The ownership of so much land by communities owing allegiance to a foreign power was an evil of immense magnitude, and the monasteries themselves were to a great extent outliving their usefulness. They had to go; and one can say *that* even while recognising the tragedy of their going.

All along we see, even in the apparently revolutionary acts of Henry's reign and afterwards, a process that was really gradual. Even the first great step was by tentative means: *præmunire*, then a guarded acceptance of the Royal Supremacy by the Church; then the dropping of the guarding phrase by Parliament, and an assertion of unqualified Royal Supremacy. The whole of Henry's acts, after his break with Rome, however, were so moulded as to give the impression that that break involved no break with ancient standards of theological belief. The Statute of the Six Articles insisted on the Mass, Transubstantiation, religious vows, etc. Henry was no Protestant. He was simply a Catholic, or conceived himself to be such, who was his own Pope. It was illogical. It could not last: but we can understand how things developed. England was entering on a new path, but did so as gradually as possible. The great thing was first to vindicate the right of the realm to enter on a new path at all. Bad though Henry's personal motives may have been, his rigorous autocracy was the only method by which the first step could have been successful.

In the reign of his youthful son and successor, Edward VI., however, Henry's theological conservatism was discarded, and definite Protestantism was adopted. Edward's own successor, Mary, entered on a violent Papal reaction.

That, also, was quite natural. The break with the past had been terrific. It would have been strange if no great party existed desiring to remedy it; and, of course, if that party attained power, it would act relentlessly. It might have succeeded in its objects had Mary lived; but her reign was brief, and the great Elizabethan era began.

The position at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign was such that but one solution of its difficulties was possible. Let us suppose that Elizabeth and her counsellors had resolved to continue in communion with Rome. That would have meant a continuation of the ferocious religious persecution of Protestants which had characterised the reign of Mary. Moreover, Elizabeth herself had a rival to the throne: Mary, Queen of the Scots. Her possession of the Crown, then, would not have been undisputed. In order to solve that difficulty, while remaining in communion with Rome, she would have had to submit to the Pope, for his decision, her claim to reign at all. In making such a petition for recognition, Elizabeth would have had to admit herself to have been the illegitimate daughter of Anne Boleyn. No doubt the Papacy, if Elizabeth had accepted all its claims, would have granted her a dispensation and a recognition of her as queen: but at what a price! Admission of her own illegitimacy; admission of the Papal right to decide as to the succession of the English Crown. Both queen and nation would have been humiliated. Neither can it be said that Elizabeth could have proceeded to reign without submitting to the Pope her claim of right so to do, and yet could have continued the religious union with Rome which Mary had re-established. In Roman canon law, Elizabeth was illegitimate, and thus could not reign unless she obtained a dispensation: and certainly that would not have been overlooked when there was a possible rival in the field. A continuation of the union with Rome, then, was impossible, save on terms of national and regnal humiliation: and for what end? So as to continue a religious policy involving relentless burnings at the stake for religious dissent.

There was no choice open. A renewed separation from Rome was inevitable. On her accession, Elizabeth requested Sir Edward Carne (then in Rome, where he had been Mary's envoy) to acquaint Pope Paul IV. with the fact of her accession. The result may be related in the words of a contemporary (Father Paul Sarpi, *History of the Council of Trent*, edition 1676, p. 385):

"The Pope, proceeding according to his usual rigour, answered that that kingdom was held in *fee* of the Apostolic See; that she [Elizabeth] could not succeed, being illegitimate; that he could not contradict the declarations of Clement VII. and Paul III.; that it was a great boldness to assume the name [of queen] and government without him; that for this she deserved not to be heard in anything. Yet being desirous to show a fatherly affection, if she will renounce her pretensions, and refer herself wholly to his free disposition, he will do whatsoever may be done with the honour of the Apostolic See. . . . But the new Queen understanding the Pope's answer, and wondering at the man's hasty disposition, thought it not profitable, either for her, or the kingdom, to treat any more with him."

Pius IV., Paul's successor, it is true wrote to Elizabeth (see Tierney's edition of Dodd's *Church History*, vol. ii., appendix, p. cccxxi): "Show yourself obedient to our fatherly persuasions and wholesome counsels, and promise to yourself from us all things that may make not only to the salvation of your soul, but also whatsoever you shall desire from us for the establishing and confirming of your princely dignity, according to the authority, place, and office, committed unto us by God." This, however, was only Paul IV. in other words, and was as impossible as ever: indeed, more so, for affairs in England were taking another course.

The Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity abolished again the Papal jurisdiction in England, and made obligatory the use of the English liturgy in place of the Latin Mass. It was ordered that all ecclesiastical persons and their officers, all judges, mayors, and "other lay or temporal officer and

minister, and every other person having Your Highness's fee or wages," should take this Oath of Supremacy :

" I, A. B., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that the Queen's Highness is the only Supreme Governor of this realm, and of all other her Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal. And that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm. And, therefore, I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities ; and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, pre-eminences, privileges, and authorities granted or belonging to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and successors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm."

In an earlier chapter a description has been given of the penal laws by which the repudiation of the Pope, and the establishment of the reformed order in the ancient Church of England, were enforced. Their severity cannot be denied, but this may be said : Had Elizabeth adhered to the Papal cause, at least equal severity would have been necessary against the Protestants, and such severity would have been clearly and professedly religious persecution unto death. Severities were inevitable either way, and undoubtedly Elizabeth's penal laws aimed at changing the old order in the Church. Her course, however, was necessary in national self-defence, and the first Roman Catholic martyr for religion (for he died for the Papal deposing power) in Elizabeth's reign was John Felton, executed in 1570—eleven years after Elizabeth's accession—for publishing Pope Pius V.'s Bull deposing the queen. He was, in the eyes of Roman Catholics, a martyr ; but obviously the English Government could not regard him as other than a traitor. The truth is, that Government was anxious to avoid the death penalty. It enforced drastic

laws to establish and perpetuate the new order in the Church; but no alternative was left to it but to do so if it was to exist: and, if it collapsed, even severer laws would have been enforced by the Roman Catholic party if in power. The Government was even careful to avoid undue vexations in administering the Oath of Supremacy. To quote a Roman Catholic writer (Rev. J. H. Pollen, S.J., in *The Month* magazine, November, 1904, p. 505): "If we look closely at this legislation, we shall discover that a great deal more than might have been expected was made to turn upon attendance at Protestant service. If a Catholic could avoid persecution on that score, if he kept studiously quiet and forewent every post under the Government, or in the Universities, or in the Church, or other professions, he might, it seems, never have the oath proposed to him at all." That, of course, is to say he would not have been molested if he acted as recognising the new order as legitimate for the State, even if repugnant to himself, and, of course, that is a hard thing to expect of any sincere believer. Still, the fact remains that the State had no choice but to enforce its laws, and, had the Papal party been in power, still worse ones would have been enforced.

In point of fact, the attendance of Roman Catholics at the churches was very large for the first part of Elizabeth's reign (that is, until the Papacy forbade it). As Father Parsons, the Jesuit missioner to England in those days, wrote, there was "division of opinions about going to the heretical churches and service, which most part of Catholics did follow for many years" (*A Briefe Apologie*, by R. Parsons, S.J., 1602; ff. 1, 2). A more modern Roman Catholic writer, alluding to the fact that many priests left the realm, says: "Had these men remained at home, patient of present evils, and submissive, as far as might be, to the laws; had they continued the practice of their religion in retirement, and distributed, without clamour, instruction to those that claimed it, the rigour of the Legislature would soon have relaxed; no jealousy would have been excited, and no penal statutes, we may now pronounce, would have entailed

misfortunes upon them or their successors" (Rev. J. Berington, *Memoirs of Panzani*, p. 20).

No attempt is here being made to deny the severity of the Elizabethan penal laws: indeed, preceding chapters have emphasised that aspect of the problem. This work, however, aims at an accurate understanding of the problem of those times. Such accurate understanding leads to these conclusions: The enforcement of the Royal Supremacy and uniformity of public worship (as distinct from inquisition into private opinions) was the policy of Elizabeth's Government, and was unavoidable; the penal laws would have been even severer under a Papal-supported *régime*; Elizabeth's Government desired to avoid, and did avoid for eleven years, the death penalty; and, finally, the powers by which she was opposed were adopting severer laws in lands where they were in power. For example, Prescott (*History of Philip the Second*, vol. ii., p. 233) says of the Spanish Inquisition, whose fires were blazing at that very time:

"Never was there a persecution which did its work more thoroughly. The blood of the martyr is commonly said to be the seed of the Church. But the storm of persecution fell as heavily on the Spanish Protestants as it did on the Albigenses in the thirteenth century, blighting every living thing, so that no germ remained for future harvests. Spain might now boast that the stain of heresy no longer defiled the hem of her garment. But at what a price was this purchased! Not merely by the sacrifice of the lives and fortunes of a few thousands of the existing generation, but by the disastrous consequences entailed for ever on the country. Folded under the dark wing of the Inquisition, Spain was shut out from the light which in the sixteenth century broke over the rest of Europe, stimulating the nations to greater enterprise in every department of knowledge. The genius of the people was rebuked, and their spirit quenched, under the malignant influence of an eye that never slumbered, of an unseen arm ever raised to strike. How could there be freedom of thought, where there was no

freedom of utterance? Or freedom of utterance, where it was as dangerous to say too little as too much? Freedom cannot go along with fear. Every way the mind of the Spaniard was in fetters."

It is, then, necessary to realise the nature and spirit of the powers to which Elizabeth's English Government was opposed. It was essentially a case of a struggle to the death. In 1570 came Pope Pius V.'s Bull of Deposition against Elizabeth:

"The Lord who reigns on high [*Regnans in Excelsis*] instituted a Church which should be one, and gave its government to Peter and his successors. This he placed above all nations and kingdoms, 'to root up and destroy, to scatter and waste, to plant and build,' in order that he may maintain a faithful people in the unity of the Spirit. In the discharge of this duty we labour with all our might to preserve that unity, now assailed by so many adversaries. Amongst others is that servant of infamy, Elizabeth, who styles herself Queen of England, the refuge of wicked men. Having taken possession of the kingdom, she monstrously usurps the chief authority in the Church, and has undone Queen Mary's reform, and filled the royal Council with obscure heretics. . . . Therefore, we declare the said Elizabeth a heretic, and a favourer of heretics, and that all who adhere to her in the aforesaid incur the sentence of anathema, and are cut off from the unity of the Body of Christ. Moreover, that she has forfeited her pretended title to the aforesaid kingdom, and is deprived of all dominion, dignity and privilege. We declare that nobles, subjects and peoples are free from any oath to her, and we interdict obedience to her monitions, mandates and laws. Those who do otherwise we involve in the same anathema."

This Bull was issued after the failure of the Northern Rising of 1569, but before the Pope knew of that failure. Had the rising succeeded, the Bull would have been put into execution; but, the rising having failed, the Roman Catholics of England were in a terrible dilemma. If they obeyed the Pope, they were traitors to their country; if

they did not obey the Pope, they were disloyal to their Church. In these circumstances, Pius V.'s successor, Gregory XIII., was asked to "explain" the Bull so as to help the recusants in their difficulty. In 1579 he "explained" it thus (see J. H. Pollen, S.J., *English Catholics in Elizabeth's Reign*, p. 293): "It always obliges her [Elizabeth] and the heretics; as for the Catholics, it obliges them in no way, while affairs stand as they do; but will only do so in the future, when the public execution of the Bull can be made."

What was that but to say that Elizabeth was still deposed, but that the recusants *might* (not even *must*!) simulate loyalty until a favourable turn of circumstances made it possible to throw off the mask? Is it wonderful that Elizabeth's minister, Burleigh, made this comment (see Pollen, p. 297), "This only means that you are loyal while you cannot resist, and that you will rebel at the first opportunity"?

Meanwhile, the seminary priests were flocking to England in all kinds of disguises. We have no need to depreciate their heroism or religious zeal (though some, like Father Parsons, S.J., were political intriguers); but it must be recognised that the spirit of Pius V. was behind their mission. Indeed, the chief organiser of the mission-colleges, Cardinal Allen, wrote thus in his *Defence of English Catholiques*, published in 1584 (see the Manresa reprint, London, 1914, vol. i., pp. 49-50): "Queen Mary against the Protestants executed only the old laws of our country, and of all Christendom, made for the punishment of heretics, by the canons and determination of all Popes, Councils, Churches and ecclesiastical tribunals of the world, allowed also and authorised by the civil and imperial laws, and received by all kingdoms Christian besides; and who then hath any cause justly to be grieved? Why should any man complain or think strange for executing the laws which are as ancient, as general, and as godly against heretics as they are for the punishment of traitors, murderers, or thieves?"

There was no alternative for Elizabeth's Government but

to use the most drastic means to meet the danger of the seminarists. The death penalty, as for high treason, was inflicted. After 1585 it was inflicted on those convicted for being foreign-ordained priests come into the realm, even if no other offence were proved. The reason of that is clear. The laws being as they were, a foreign-ordained priest coming into the realm was by that very fact an enemy; after the Bull of Deposition, such priest was presumptively a supporter of the policy of deposing the queen; and, if he were an English subject, then, if called upon to repudiate the Deposing Bull, he failed to do so, was he not thereby involved in treason? It was a terrible dilemma; but it was logically implied in the terms of the Papal Bull.

Meanwhile, there were schemes for the promotion of invasion from abroad. Pope Gregory XIII. was exceedingly insistent in urging King Philip II. of Spain to send an armed force to overthrow the Elizabethan Government. For example, in 1577 there was the proposal that Don John of Austria should undertake such an expedition and, if successful, place Mary, Queen of the Scots, on the English throne. Gregory XIII. sent Mgr. Sega to Don John as his nuncio, with an offer of 50,000 ducats for the expedition. Some months later, the Pontiff appointed Mgr. Sega as nuncio at Madrid, with instructions to importune King Philip to take armed measures against Elizabeth of England. The Pope offered to be responsible for supplying 4,000 to 5,000 men for the service. The celebrated but hapless expedition under Sir Thomas Stukely was equipped by the Pope for the invasion of Ireland. However, Stukely betrayed his trust, sailed on another route, and perished—with Sebastian, King of Portugal—at Alcazar in Morocco: August 4, 1578.

Had Stukely not been faithless to his employer, the expedition which he headed would have been a grave menace to the English Government. It is an interesting example of the way England was liable to be attacked by foreign powers from an Irish base. "On December 1, 1571, the Cardinal Secretary [of State, in Rome] wrote to his chief

representative in Spain, the Legate Cardinal Alessandrino, saying that the Pope had heard with pleasure of Stukely's plans, and that if the King did not wish to involve his own name in supporting these plans, the Pope would allow them to be started in his, always recognising that the responsibility for action must rest entirely (*in tutto et per tutto*) with the King. . . . Philip held his hand, and nothing was done for the next three years. . . . [But eventually there came to be] a general consensus on this point, that a raid, even if it fails, will not make matters worse than they were, and might even relieve the pressure. . . . In the meantime the Pope caused a careful search to be made for the records of the old Papal rights in these islands regarding taxation and the like" (Pollen, *English Catholics under Elizabeth*, pp. 195-220).

It may be mentioned that, about the time he was preparing his Deposing Bull, Pope Pius V., who was a warm supporter of methods such as those employed by Alva in the Netherlands ("Pius had in the meantime conceived no little admiration for Alva's vigour and military skill": Pollen, p. 144), was urging that terrible devastator to invade England. "An opportunity of writing to Alva was offered by the news of a rising in Suffolk, which took place in July [1570], and probably became known in Rome at the end of October. On the 3rd of November, therefore, the Pope wrote to Alva, earnestly urging him to make the most of the opportunity" (Pollen, pp. 145-146). Alva, however, was otherwise engaged; but the incident still further illustrates the kind of menaces the Elizabethan Government had to face.

On May 20, 1588, the Spanish Armada, under the Duke of Medina Sidonia, sailed from Lisbon. It comprised 130 ships, with 8,050 sailors, 18,973 soldiers, and others—priests, servants, etc.—bringing the total to 30,493. It met bad weather, and took shelter in Corunna on June 9, whence it proceeded on its English journey on July 12.

Lord Howard of Effingham, the English admiral (he had conformed to the new order in religion, so was not a

Roman Catholic), was for sending a fleet to attack the Spanish coast; but Elizabeth would not allow that. The coming Spanish fleet was sighted off the Scilly Isles on July 19. The English opposing fleet consisted of 197 vessels, some of them very small, but their firing was more efficient than that of the Spaniards. Most of this fleet was at Plymouth, though a few ships watched the east of the English Channel.

The object of the Spanish armament was to sail to the Netherlands and convey a Spanish army to England. That of the English fleet, on the other hand, was to prevent this by breaking up Medina Sidonia's fleet-order. The English attacked the Spaniards twice—July 23 and 25—but did not succeed in breaking the enemy's formation or in forcing a general engagement. The Spaniards anchored in the Calais Roads on July 27. There they were attacked by English fire-ships, and a panic ensued. The Spanish ships cut themselves adrift and fled. They became scattered, and were attacked in the rear by the English. An attempt to reconstitute their formation failed. A storm broke and scattered them still worse. The Armada was destroyed by the tempests, and such vessels as escaped were shattered on the Irish and Scottish coasts. It was, in reality, a wondrous escape for England, for the untrained levies mustered by Elizabeth at Tilbury would have had little chance against the veterans of the Spanish army had it landed.

When we view the terrible menaces which England, a small island opposed to mightiest powers, had to face in those days, we can understand the passionate vigour of such writers as John Jewel, Elizabeth's Bishop of Salisbury, who, in his *Apology for the Church of England*, said: "But what! Will the Bishop of Rome accuse us of treason? Will *he* pretend to teach the people to be submissive and obedient to rulers? or hath *he* any regard to authority at all? . . . Why does he boast himself to be 'King of Kings,' and that he hath over them, as his subjects, a kingly power? Why doth he compel emperors and kings,

by oath, to be true to him? Why does he boast that the majesty of the Emperor is seventy-times seven inferior to his own? . . . Why doth he, where it is his pleasure, set Christian princes at variance; and, to serve his own will, trouble the whole world with insurrections? Why does he proscribe and brand, as a heathen and a pagan, whatever Christian prince doth shake off his authority? . . ."

Passionate words!—but we must realise the circumstances amidst which they were written. The men who thought and wrote thus knew well the perils amidst which they lived.

In the reign of James I. the dangers were rather those of obscure plots than of menace from abroad. True, a section of English "Papists" still hoped for Spanish aid, and the Gunpowder Plotters were of that number; but the Plot probably was known to the Government all along, and was participated in only by a small section of Roman Catholics. The Government seized the conspirators at the critical moment, and further severities against recusants followed. In Charles I.'s reign the problems of England were complicated tragically by his conflicts with his people. Charles intrigued with the Roman Catholics of Ireland; but his own execution, followed by the Commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell, led to the suppression of the Established Church as well as to a relentless war against the Irish Roman Catholics. After the Restoration, Charles II.—a Roman Catholic at heart, so far as he had any faith at all—was governed simply by the determination to keep his throne at all costs. He "would not go upon his travels again." He was false to the Scots, whose Covenant he had sworn to observe. He was false to the Roman Catholics, whom he abandoned to the fury of the panic excited by Titus Oates's spurious "Popish Plot." He was false to the Anglican Church, when he signed with Louis of France a secret treaty favourable to the re-establishment of Roman Catholicism. "The most important conditions of the alliance between the Crowns [*i.e.*, between Louis and Charles] were digested into a secret treaty which

was signed at Dover in May 1670, just ten years after the day on which Charles had landed at that very port amidst the acclamations and joyful tears of a too confiding people. By this treaty Charles bound himself to make public profession of the Roman Catholic religion, to join his arms to those of Lewis for the purpose of destroying the power of the United Provinces, and to employ the whole strength of England, by land and sea, in support of the rights of the House of Bourbon to the vast monarchy of Spain. Lewis, on the other hand, engaged to pay a large subsidy, and promised that, if any insurrection should break out in England, he would send an army at his own charge to support his ally " (Macaulay, *History of England*, chapter ii.). The treaty of course came to nothing ; but it serves to show what dangers existed not only to England, but to such freedom as existed on the Continent, had power existed to put despotic designs into full effect.

The danger in England, however, became very real under Charles's successor, James II. It is unnecessary to take a prejudiced view of that monarch's acts. As a convert to Roman Catholicism, he was sincere and ardent in his belief—though his personal morality was inferior to his theological orthodoxy. There was still in England a considerable Roman Catholic party. Had James been sincere in his professed desire for toleration to all, and had he proceeded by constitutional means, he might have been one of our best monarchs. Unfortunately, toleration for all was not—it is not, even now—a tenet of the Church which he had joined, and there can be no doubt that his ultimate purpose was the restoration of Roman Catholic domination. When he proceeded to attempt attainment of that purpose by abusing a prerogative for employing which one of his predecessors had lost his head, is it strange James lost his throne ?

The defence, however, that one able modern writer has made of James II., is this (Hilaire Belloc, *James the Second*, 1928, p. 32) : " James's object, on which he pondered as heir, which he would bring into effect when he should

reign, was to restore Popular Monarchy, or, as he would have said, to insist on its rights and duties; especially its duty of protecting minorities and enforcing justice. He regarded these ancient rights as still existing in their full vigour, and the corresponding duties therefore capable of being performed. It was an illusion. Popular Monarchy was fallen long ago and could not be revived. In his attempt to revive it James was dealing with material quite intractable. He wholly failed."

This defence is a mass of fallacies: half-truths which, taken as whole truths, gravely mislead. "Popular Monarchy?" As an ideal, no doubt it may be regarded as noble; but what of *the reality*? Was the monarchy of the Middle Ages "popular"? It may have been the only possible system then, but it was a system suited only for undeveloped cultures: it implied feudalism, constant war, and a social framework largely composed of serfs. Mr. Belloc refers to our modern Parliament as "the organ of wealth." It is the organ of wealth only if all the other organs of public opinion are also organs of wealth, and if, therefore, the electors choose members of Parliament who favour the wealthy classes. It is open to them to do otherwise. And was the mediæval "popular monarchy" not an "organ of wealth"? When villeins were "bound to the soil," being legally forbidden any hope of improvement save by the will of their wealthy owners; when the wealthy owned castles, and were cased in mail; had "wealth" no dominance in politics? Or does Mr. Belloc allude to a later time: to Charles I., say? What form of "popular monarchy" was *that*, which ruled by the Star Chamber and the prerogative? Did Charles consult the people (*populus*)? Mr. Belloc, when he says "popular monarchy," means, really, *arbitrary* monarchy: a monarchy which would be ready to make an oratorical appeal to the populace against the aristocrats, or the rich, if some party emergency seemed to make that desirable; but which would equally be willing to grind the populace with force and arms if the emergency were different: a monarchy, in short, intent

mainly on its own autocracy and self-will. James II., in his own mind, may have gilded his designs with romantic ideals of "popular monarchy" (though more probably that is an imagination of his modern apologists); but the naked reality was that he wished to rule without respect for law, and, in "protecting minorities," to advance, by arbitrary power, a religion detested by the majority of the people and which itself was opposed to the principle of toleration professedly held by the monarch who was advancing it.

Whatever the defects (and they were great) of the Parliamentary system which James II. "encountered," those defects were capable of remedy by means of the system itself. James, however, if he had triumphed, would have imposed upon England, under an oratorical plea of "tolerance" and "justice," a despotism in Church and State, from which only another sanguinary rising, like that against Charles I., could have freed the country. It was necessary that James II. should go.

CHAPTER VII

FROM 1688 TO EMANCIPATION

"JAMES II.," says Mr. Arthur Hassall (*The Cambridge Modern History*, v., 51-52), "owing to his change of religion, showed himself to be more closely attached to France than had been Charles II. His self-confidence was such as to make him believe that the conversion of England to Roman Catholicism was possible, and could be brought about by his own efforts, backed up by the aid of the French King." With regard to his professed desire for the simple reign of toleration, the distinguished Roman Catholic writer, Mr. W. S. Lilly, said (*Catholic Encyclopædia*, v., 452): "It is true that the Declaration [of Indulgence] was full of professions of love for liberty of conscience—professions which came oddly from a monarch with James's record. Moreover, as we now know, upon the very eve of publishing it he had written to congratulate Louis XIV. upon his revocation of the Edict of Nantes, an example which Barillon, a very competent judge, thought he would have only too gladly followed if he had been able. Those hollow and palpably false professions deceived no one."

"On October 26 [1688] Sunderland was suddenly dismissed from office. Barely four months had passed since he had purchased a new lease of royal favour by open conformity to Roman Catholicism. Men were puzzled to account for his sudden downfall. . . . The probability is that Sunderland had lost the king's confidence when he became the advocate of concession, and that his enemies at last gained the upper hand" (Professor R. Lodge, *Political History of England*, 1910, viii., 287). In dismissing the Earl of Sunderland from the post of chief minister, James lost the most sagacious adviser he could have had.

Ten days later William of Orange landed at Torbay. James hesitated as to his course of action, and his supporters began to desert him. Lord Cornbury, the eldest son of the Earl of Clarendon, deserted from the army. Sir Edward Seymour, with a large number of gentlemen of the western counties, joined William at Exeter. Lord Delamere and the Earl of Devonshire raised forces to support William in the midlands. Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, seized the garrisons of York on behalf of William. James fled to France.

A general election was held, and the resulting Convention (the flight of James, and the lack as yet of any formally acknowledged successor, made it impossible to summon a normal Parliament) met on January 22, 1689. It was found that the Whig party dominated the assembly. "And their activity and confidence were in excess of their numbers. Events and fought on their side. All their gloomy forecasts as to the danger of allowing a Papist to ascend the throne had been fulfilled by James's reign. And, while they could point to the past to prove their foresight, they had no hesitation as to the fitting remedy for the evils which they had prophesied. The doctrine of indefeasible hereditary right they treated with scorn in 1686 as they had done in 1679. They were prepared to fill the throne in accordance with the interests of the people, and to impose any desirable restrictions upon the power of the chosen prince" (Lodge, p. 301).

On February 13 the Lords and Commons delivered to the Prince and Princess of Orange a Declaration of Rights. They were accepted, and in December became—with some alterations—law. The Act was entitled "An Act declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and settling the Succession of the Crown." After detailing the unconstitutional acts of James II., his abdication, the consequent vacancy of the Crown, and the summoning of the Convention, it declared for these "ancient rights and liberties":

"1. That the pretended power of suspending of laws or the execution of laws by regal authority without consent

of Parliament is illegal. 2. That the pretended power of dispensing with laws or the execution of laws by regal authority, as it hath been assumed and exercised of late, is illegal. 3. That the commission for erecting the late court of commissioners for ecclesiastical causes, and all other commissions and courts of like nature, are illegal and pernicious. 4. That levying money for or to the use of the Crown, by pretence of prerogative, without grant of Parliament, for longer time or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted, is illegal. 5. That it is the right of the subjects to petition the king, and all commitments or prosecutions for such petitioning are illegal. 6. That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with the consent of Parliament, is against law. 7. That the subjects which are Protestants may have arms for their defence suitable to their conditions, and as allowed by law. 8. That elections of members of Parliament ought to be free. 9. That the freedom of speech, and debates or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament. 10. That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel or unusual punishments inflicted. 11. That jurors ought to be duly impanelled and returned, and jurors which pass upon men in trials for high treason ought to be freeholders. 12. That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons before conviction are illegal and void. 13. And that for redress of all grievances, and for the amending, strengthening and preserving of the laws, Parliament ought to be held frequently."

William and Mary had been formally proclaimed King and Queen on February 13. They held their thrones by election and not by hereditary, or any imaginary Divine, right; and on the conditions named in the Bill of Rights. In order to ensure the exclusion of any Roman Catholic from the throne, when the Bill of Rights was passed a test was imposed on all future sovereigns in the shape of a declaration against Transubstantiation and other Roman

Catholic doctrines and practices. An exclusion was also imposed against any who should marry a Roman Catholic.

A plain, emphatic, and most earnest statement may here be made; and it will be placed in italics:

In these enervated days after the Great War of 1914-1918, *there is a tendency to neglect or forget the struggles of our forefathers for freedom. We seem in these times, when we are remote from those struggles themselves, to be in danger of losing memory of them or of their meaning. As, however, eternal watchfulness is the price of liberty, such forgetfulness would be folly. The primary principles vindicated, however imperfectly, in* 1688, *are of the essence of our freedom and progress. On one side were arbitrary monarchy and ecclesiastical intolerance wedded to that claim of infallibility which is a fatal bar to progress. On the other were maxims essential to civil and religious liberty. No doubt the maxims were imperfectly understood; but they were there, and would become better understood as time went on: whereas, opposed to them, were despotism and obscurantism. When, then, rhetoricians attempt to depict in attractive words such rulers as James II., and to present them as "Popular Monarchs," friends of tolerance: then we can but reiterate the historic facts which show them to have been despots in thought and act and professed believers in tolerance in order to advance a cause opposed to tolerance. There is serious danger in the present tendencies to forget the lessons of the past. Our forefathers—in however imperfect a way: for things have to go by stages, and no man can go entirely outside his century—saved our liberties. We must not forget what they did, or we shall lose what they saved. These are not days in which to forget what freedom is. The fact that our forefathers did not carry freedom to its full development does not alter the fact that the principles they vindicated were necessary if freedom was to survive at all.*

William and Mary, though now King and Queen, were far from personally popular. William's foreign, cold ways estranged people. Further, the necessity for electing them as King and Queen could not obliterate the sentiments of loyalty to the old Royal House. That sentiment was powerful. The new monarchs were proclaimed in Scotland,

and three commissioners (the Earl of Argyll, Sir James Montgomery, and Sir John Dalrymple) were sent to London to make to them the formal offer of the Scottish Crown, and to state the conditions of such acceptance. Those conditions were a "claim of right" and certain "articles of grievance," which William and Mary were required to accept. The claim of right differed from that of England in two important respects. James had left England deliberately, and the English Convention interpreted that as an abdication. He had never even been in Scotland since his accession, so could not have quitted it. The Scottish Convention, then, definitely declared him to have "forfeited" the Crown. The second respect in which the Scottish claim of right differed from the English was in its containing a denunciation of episcopacy as "an insupportable grievance." Further, the claim of right was followed by articles of grievance, requiring large changes in the Scottish system of government. William accepted the conditions thus proposed to him, though he demurred to some which tended in the direction of religious persecution.

In 1689 there was a rising in Dundee and the Highlands: not so much because of devotion to the house of Stuart or to Roman Catholicism, as because the Highlanders' pride was hurt by a mere Lowland Convention having called a new ruler to the throne. On July 27 occurred the Battle of the Pass of Killiecrankie. The wild Highland warriors, with their claymores, won the day. In 1692 was the terrible Massacre of Glencoe. It is idle to deny the atrocity of that event, or to palliate William's connivance at it. Yet in justice it must be said that it "would probably have been numbered among the little-known tragedies of highland history, if it had not served as a convenient instrument of party strife" (Lodge, p. 338).

In Ireland it was that James II. found his hopes of regaining his throne. He landed at Kinsale on March 12, 1689. Two days later he was at Cork, where Tyrconnell—Richard Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnell, whom James, while

still recognised as king in England, had sent to Ireland as Lord Deputy—welcomed the exiled monarch. James entered Dublin in state (March 24), and summoned a Parliament for May 7. "He had apparently good reason for elation. Three provinces, Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, were in the hands of the natives, who had overpowered the scattered minority of settlers. In Ulster the Protestants, driven from their lands, had taken refuge in Enniskillen and Londonderry. Neither town was adequately fortified, and it was confidently expected that a vigorous attack would force them to surrender" (Lodge, p. 347). On the appearance of James's army before the walls of Derry, however, the city resolved on resistance. Then ensued the famous siege. "The tale of that heroic defence has been so told that it need assuredly never, while the world lasts, be told again. Suffice it then that despite the falseness of its governor, the weakness of its walls, the lack of any military training on the part of its defenders; despite the treacherous dismissal of the first ships sent to its assistance; despite the long agony of seeing other ships containing provisions hanging inertly at the mouth of the bay; despite shell and shot without, and famine in its most grisly forms within—despite all this the little garrison held gallantly on to the 'last ounce of horse-flesh and the last pinch of corn'" (Emily Lawless, *Ireland*, 1912, p. 286). At last, however, the city was relieved, and James's army departed.

When James's summoned Parliament assembled, it was composed almost exclusively of Roman Catholics. It set aside the Act of Settlement, and drew up a terrific Bill of Attainder, condemning 2,240 persons to forfeit all their goods.

In June, however, William landed at Carrickfergus at the head of an army of 35,000 men: of whom only about a third were English, the rest being Swedes, Dutch, Swiss, Batavians, French Huguenots, and Finns. On July 1 was fought the Battle of the Boyne. Mr. Belloc (*James the Second*, p. 300) thinks the fighting of that battle an error:

"The Boyne was fought because James hesitated to uncover the capital. He had to uncover it sooner or later, so the decision was unwise; but this fear of the moral effect of letting the enemy occupy territory unopposed, even when it is politically justified, is a source of military weakness. It is also possible that James's staff had insufficient information of the enemy's superiority." Anyway, one of the world's decisive battles was fought, and James was defeated; he fled south and sailed back to France in solitary humiliation.

William, in Dublin, issued a proclamation offering amnesty to all who lay down their arms. Athlone, Galway, Cork, Kinsale, and Limerick, however, still held out. The Duke of Marlborough obliged Cork to surrender at the end of September, and Kinsdale early in October. General Godert van Ginkel besieged Limerick; it capitulated on August 12; and the Treaty of Limerick was signed, guaranteeing a peace on terms of freedom for Roman Catholics as for Protestants. As we have seen in an earlier chapter, the treaty was not fulfilled, and a terrible era of suffering set in for the Roman Catholic Irish.

In England the Roman Catholics also felt the reaction from the times of James: with, of course, this difference—in England they were a minority, while in Ireland they were the great majority of the people. "The disfavour with which [Roman] Catholics were viewed when William and Mary were placed on the throne vacated by James II. was natural enough. They shared in the hatred inspired by the perfidy, cruelty, and tyranny of the absconded sovereign. William, indeed, would have gladly extended to them the same measure of toleration which, in spite of Tory opposition, he was able to secure for Protestant Nonconformists. He was under great obligations not only to the Emperor, but also to the Pope, whose sympathy and diplomatic support had been of much help to him in his perilous enterprise. He was, by temperament and by conviction, averse from religious persecution" (Lilly, in *Catholic Encyclopædia*, v., 452).

However, it was not to be. Not only were all the existing penal laws against Roman Catholics retained, but others were added. In judging that matter, we must realise the point of view of our forefathers of those days. We may quote Lecky (*England in the Eighteenth Century*, i., 335-338):

"The measures against [the Roman Catholics] may no doubt derive a very considerable palliation from the atrocious persecutions of which Catholicism had been guilty in almost every country in which it had triumphed, from the incessant plots against the life and power of Elizabeth, and from the intimate connection, both before and after the Revolution, between the Catholicism of the Stuarts and their political conduct and prospects. Catholicism, indeed, never can be looked upon merely as a religion. It is a great and highly organised kingdom, recognising no geographical frontiers, governed by a foreign sovereign, pervading temporal politics with its manifold influence, and attracting to itself much of the enthusiasm which would otherwise flow in national channels. . . . Nor should it be forgotten that, in the closing years of the seventeenth and in the first half of the eighteenth century, the spirit of Romish persecution, though gradually subsiding, was still far from extinct. Thus we find Stanhope writing from Majorca in 1691: 'Tuesday last there were burnt here twenty-seven Jews and heretics, and to-morrow I shall see executed above twenty more, and Tuesday next, if I stay here so long, is to be another *fiesta*, for so they entitle a day dedicated to so execrable an act.' In 1706 Wilcox, who was afterwards Bishop of Rochester, but who was at this time minister of the English factory at Lisbon, wrote a letter to Burnet describing an *auto-da-fé* in that city, in which four persons were burnt in the presence of the king, and of these one woman remained alive for half-an-hour, and one man for more than an hour, in the flames, vainly imploring their executioners to heap fresh fagots on the fire in order to terminate their agony. Every considerable town in England, Holland, and Protestant Germany, con-

tained a colony of Frenchmen, who, after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, had been driven from their homes by a persecution of extreme ferocity; a long course of the most atrocious cruelties had kindled the flame of rebellion in the Cevennes, and at the time of the Peace of Utrecht 188 French Protestants were released by English intercession from the galleys. In 1717 an assembly of seventy-four Protestants being surprised at Andure, the men were sent to the galleys and the women to prison. In 1724, in the corrupt and generally sceptical period of the Regency, a new law was made against the Protestants of France which aggravated even the atrocious enactments of Louis XIV. By one clause all who assembled for the exercise of the Protestant worship, even in their own homes, became liable to lifelong servitude in the galleys and to the confiscation of all their goods. Another condemned to death any Protestant minister exercising any religious function whatever, and to the galleys any witness who failed to denounce him. A third enjoined all physicians to inform the priest of the condition of every dying patient, in order that, whether he desired it or not, a Catholic priest should be present at his deathbed. A fourth, with a rare refinement of ingenious malice, rendered any Protestant who, by his religious exhortations, strengthened a dying relative in his faith, liable to the galleys and to the confiscation of his goods. A Protestant pastor was hanged at Montpellier in 1728; another would have suffered the same fate in 1732 had he not succeeded in escaping from his prison; and 277 Protestants in Dauphiny were condemned to the galleys in 1745 and 1746. As late as the Peace of Paris, a Protestant minister wrote to the Duke of Bedford imploring the intercession of the English Government in favour of thirty-three men, who were in the galleys at Toulon, and of sixteen women, who were imprisoned in Languedoc, for no other offence than that of having attended Protestant assemblies. Many of them, he added, had remained in captivity for more than thirty years. Similar complaints came from Hungary, where the interference of the Emperor

with the religious liberty of the Protestants contributed largely to the insurrection of Rákóczy; from Silesia, where the same interference prepared the way for the ultimate severance of the province from the Austrian rule; from Poland, where the persecution fomented in 1724 by the Jesuits at Thorn aroused the indignation of all Protestant Europe, and where the complete exclusion of religious dissidents from political power in 1733 was sowing dissensions that were the sure precursors of the approaching ruin. In the course of 1732 and the two following years, about 17,000 German Protestants were compelled by the persecution of the Archbishop of Salzburg to abandon their homes, and to seek a refuge in Prussia or in Georgia. Ten persons were burnt for their religious opinions in Spain between 1746 and 1759. Two persons were executed, and many others condemned to less severe penalties, by the Inquisition in Portugal in 1756. These things will not be forgotten by a candid judge in estimating the policy of the English Government towards Catholics. On the other hand, he will remember that the English Catholics were so few and so inconsiderable that it was absurd to regard them as a serious danger to the State; that they had in general shown themselves under the most trying circumstances eminently moderate and loyal, and that although the Catholic priests, whenever they were in the ascendant, were then, as ever, a persecuting body, Catholicism as a whole had ceased, since the Peace of Westphalia, to divide the interests of Europe. . . . The Popes, who, as spiritual heads of Christendom, had employed all their temporal and spiritual weapons against Elizabeth [of England], had never acted in this manner against her successors."

The Treaty of Westphalia (1648) had indeed been a landmark in European history. Marking the end of the Thirty Years' War of religion, it marked also the geographical limits of the formation of Protestant communities: but it marked also a third great fact—the definite ending of the mediæval theory of the Popes as dominating States. *Unam Sanctam* died in 1648; not in theory, for it still remained in

the books, but in fact. (Unless, indeed, some great change in the world at some future date may . . . ?)

The Peace of Westphalia, then, certainly marked "a distinct epochal line . . ., with which the formation of great Protestant territories came to an end"; but it marked also the end of the Papal overlordship of States: "The phrase of the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), *cujus regio ejus religio*, *i.e.*, the religion of the prince is the religion of the land, sums up the secular reply to the ecclesiastical order" (Professor J. P. Kirsch, and Dom Bede Jarrett, in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, vii., 370, and xi., 454).

The *cujus regio* stage in social development, however, was a very imperfect one. It was a good deal to have realised that no potentate has a right to dictate theological beliefs for compulsory enforcement by *all* States; but it was also needful to realise that no smaller potentates have a right to dictate theological belifs to all citizens of *some* States. Men should form their beliefs conscientiously, without external legal coercion. At the end of the seventeenth century this was coming to be realised; but the realisation was very imperfect: *very* imperfect.

Parliament itself, of course, was in a decidedly defective condition. It is far from perfect even in our own days; but it was *fantastic* then, so far as the methods of election were concerned. For nearly a century and a half after 1688—to be precise, until the Reform Act of 1832—there was the farce of the "rotten boroughs." Old Sarum comes to the mind at once; of it a work (*The Representative History of Great Britain and Ireland*, by T. H. B. Oldfield, London, 1816, v., 215), written when that "borough" returned two members to the Commons, said: "Old Sarum, or Old Salisbury, an ancient borough, in the parish of Stratford under the Castle, hundred of Underditch, Wilts, $1\frac{3}{4}$ miles from Salisbury; and though, as Walker says, it once covered the summit of a high steep hill, is now reduced to part of the foundation only of the old castle, containing neither house nor inhabitant. This borough returned members to Parliament 23d. Edward I., and then

intermitted till 34th Edward III., since when it has constantly returned." There were constant petitions against the anomaly of such "a spot of ground, because it was formerly inhabited, possessing municipal rights, having a nominal bailiff and burgesses, and returning two members to Parliament" (Oldfield, p. 218). Returns from Old Sarum were disputed in 1660, 1669, 1688, 1705, and 1715; but the "borough" continued. "Old Sarum was the property of the late Lord Camelford, who sold it to the present Earl of Caledon. His lordship nominates seven voters for the election day, who return the two members" (Oldfield, p. 219).

Old Sarum, of course, was the worst case; but the whole system of representation in the Commons was full of abuses. Of the borough of Wallingford, in Berks, Oldfield (iii., 41) said: "This borough is not under the influence of a patron; but corruption has long obtained in it a systematic establishment. The price of a vote is forty guineas; and the character, or the political principles, of a candidate are never very severely scrutinised where such a custom prevails." Buckingham County: "The Marquis of Buckingham has the absolute nomination of one member for this county" (iii., 51). Buckingham Town: "This town, although it gives name to the county, is of the utmost insignificance, and comes exactly under the description of a *rotten borough*. It possessed great opulence, and was the county town, where the assizes were held, until, by the partiality of Lord Chief Justice Baldwin, who bought the manor in the reign of Henry VIII., the county gaol, assizes, and county business were removed to Aylesbury. The corporation consists entirely of the friends and dependents of the Marquis of Buckingham, who has the sole and absolute disposal of the borough" (iii., 56-57). (In 1816 there were 13 voters!) Great Marlow, in Bucks: "This borough is the sole property of Owen Williams, Esq., of Temple. . . . It is one of those many boroughs which can boast of no privilege except that of voting at the will of a superior" (iii., 95). Agmondesham (Amersham),

Bucks : " This borough, which includes in its limits no more than one half of the place which bears the above name, is wholly the property of Thomas Tyrwhitt Drake, Esq., of Shardeloes, near this place. Sir William Drake, Bart., bought it of the Earl of Bedford in the reign of Charles II. It is one of those towns which admit of no opposition ; for none can be made where no political will is enjoyed, and where the privilege of franchise is only the necessity of obedience " (iii., 98). Chester Town : " Although the number of electors is above 1,000, its representation has been entirely at the disposal of Earl Grosvenor, whose family have possessed the same influence, except in one or two instances at the Revolution, ever since the reign of Charles II. This influence is created and preserved by 'securing the corporation,' which does not appear to be *immaculate*, for more than a century, and by obtaining a lease from the Crown of a number of tenements in this city. The members of the corporation, letting these from year to year only, as his Lordship's agents, to electors, at low rents, operate so far on their fears and necessities as to control their independence. To secure their own houses, they care not whom they send to reside in the House of the nation " (iii., 114). Cambridge County : " The aristocratic interest prevailing in this county is that of the Duke of Rutland and Earl of Hardwick conjointly. Their relations or friends have succeeded in every election so long, that it intimidates every person who might be otherwise disposed to offer himself as candidate against this formidable influence. It must be, however, observed, that the Duke of Bedford, having great property in this county, has a considerable interest. Should a contest, however, arise from this circumstance, instead of restoring the independence of the freeholders, it would only be a struggle for the pre-eminence of aristocracy. Thus the freedom of choice inherent in the people must be ever overwhelmed while the exercise of elective franchise is transferred from person to property " (iii., 118). Huntingdon Town : " This borough has been under the influence of the Earl

of Sandwich and his ancestors ever since the reign of Charles II., and has upon all occasions submitted to his nomination in the election of their members" (iv., 50). Grantham: "This borough has been generally influenced in the return of their members by the Duke of Rutland and Lord Brownlow, and the ancestors of those noblemen ever since the restoration in 1660" (iv., 142). Milborn Port, Somersetshire: "This insignificant borough . . . is a feudal institution as absurd as most of the manorial customs introduced since the Conquest. Nine patches of borough land, the property of two men, give a right of voting for members of Parliament to any nine persons to whom the proprietors choose to convey them for that purpose" (iv., 491-492).

It is all too sadly true that the House of Commons was, as Mr. Belloc says, "the organ of wealth"; but what argument is that in favour of James II., or against the maxims of civil and religious liberty which were legally established in 1688? Was Parliament less corrupt under James than under William? Were maxims of liberty false because the House which adopted them was defective? Maxims of liberty and justice are such *of their own nature;* and they contain within themselves the potentialities of remedying abuses existing in other acts of those who establish them.

The position of the Roman Catholics in England, after 1688, was deplorable. We may here allude, however, to an argument which has been advanced to the effect that the grievance against the "deposing power of the Pope" is unreasonable, seeing that Protestants deposed James II. "Catholics had been tortured and put to death, not for maintaining only, but simply for refusing to deny, that a king who grossly abused his trust might justly be deposed by the sentence of the Pope, as the common father of Christendom. Protestantism had maintained that this was a wicked doctrine; that no power could depose an anointed king; the duty of passive obedience had been solemnly enunciated by the University of Oxford only five years before the Revolution. Now, on a sudden, the king was

deposed, and most Protestants were delighted. It appeared, therefore, that there was a lawful 'deposing power,' but that it resided, not in the Pope, but *in any strong political party assisted by a foreign army*" (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 313).

Such an argument, however, if directed against the Revolution of 1688, is merely perverse. When a monarch was deposed by the Pope, it by no means followed that such monarch really had "abused his trust." King John was one of the worst kings we have ever had, yet the thunders of the Vatican were directed against him only when he did that which offended Papal claims; and, when he owned himself a vassal of the Holy See, the Pope thereafter stood his friend, even against Magna Charta. A bad monarch might be deposed by the Pope; a good monarch might be. The criterion was not badness or goodness as monarch, but compliance or non-compliance with Papal claims or the doctrines of Latin theological orthodoxy. Moreover, the Revolution of 1688 rejected both the Papal deposing power *and* the "divine right" doctrine which had been "solemnly enunciated by the University of Oxford only five years before." Its claim was that a nation has a sovereign right to be free and to choose its own rulers. That that claim was vindicated by the only means possible in those times, and that those means were imperfect, is recognised; but the principle itself was true, and bears no resemblance to the Papal deposing power. Both the Papal deposing power, and the "divine right of kings," were claims that an autocratic ruler (one spiritual, the other temporal) can override the laws of nations. The principle of the Revolution of 1688 was that nations should be free to choose their own laws and rulers.

As regards Roman Catholics, however, it must be acknowledged that, after 1688, the position in England was as sad as in Ireland it was tragic. They were debarred from public life, and lived in the shadow of humiliation. In 1689 it was enacted that Papists, and reputed Papists, should remove at least ten miles from Westminster. An-

other Act (same year) ordered all Papists to be disarmed, and legalised the seizure of a horse of any Papist if the animal were worth over £5. In that same year, the Toleration Act extended wide relief to Dissenters—but a special clause excepted "any Papist or Popish recusant" from the benefits. In 1699 an Act "for further preventing the growth of Popery" legalised rewards of £100 for the discovery and conviction of Popish priests: either for saying Mass or for keeping any school. The same Act contained clauses legalising the transfer of the estate of any Popish landowner to the next-of-kin should the latter become a Protestant.

The Stuart cause was far from dead in the realm, as the risings of 1715 and 1745 showed. Those risings were crushed; but it must not be imagined that they had never had any hope of success. The army in 1715 was exceedingly weak. The estimates of 1714 had provided for only 22,000 men, and two-thirds of those were in Flanders or the colonies. The insurgents were defeated at the battles of Sheriffmuir and Preston, but "none the less the peril to England was great" (J. W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 1899, ii., 7). The hopes of the Jacobites continued, and in 1745 Prince Charles Edward, the Young Pretender, landed at Loch-nan-Uamh, between Moidart and Arisaig. On August 19 he raised his standard at Glenfinnan, at the head of 1,600 men. In the middle of September he entered Edinburgh; took up his quarters in historic Holyrood; and, after halting there only one day, marched south. He won the battle of Prestonpans. "The moral effect of Prestonpans was prodigious. Twice the English troops had faced the Highlanders, and each time they had fled in panic" (Fortescue, ii., 131). When, however, the Pretender's forces invaded England, things took a different aspect. The desperation of their enterprise became apparent. In December, "English troops now began to close in upon the little rebel army from every side. [General] Wade was moving down upon it from the north. [The Duke of] Cumberland lay before it with eight thousand

men at Lichfield, while a still larger force of militia, stiffened by battalions of the Guards, was in process of concentration at Finchley Common for the defence of London. Still the rebels pushed their march southward, the people staring at them as they passed, amused but indifferent, and apparently hardly able to take the matter seriously" (Fortescue, ii., 135-136). Nevertheless, by a piece of adroit strategy the rebels eluded Cumberland's forces and set out for London. A panic there ensued. "The capital was in consternation. Business was suspended, all shops were shut, and the Bank of England escaped disaster only by making its payments in sixpences in order to gain time" (Fortescue, ii., 136). At the time, the Pretender's forces were at Derby; but influences against further advance prevailed in his camp. On December 6 he began a retreat. The siege of Stirling, January, 1746, witnessed an indecisive result, but it would have been a defeat for the rebels but for a panic which seized the English troops: terrified by legendary stories of the Highlanders' invincibility and preternatural ferocity. In the middle of April occurred the Battle of Culloden Moor, where the Pretender's troops, "now reduced to five thousand starving, dispirited men" (Fortescue, ii., 144), were finally defeated. It was the end of Jacobitism as a menace to the Protestant dynasty.

One can imagine the hopelessness which must have seemed the only outlook of Roman Catholics in this land in those days. In England, a small minority, they were prohibited from exercising their religion; they were forbidden to educate their children in the tenets of their faith here, or to send them abroad for that purpose; they could not serve either in the army or in the navy; they could not be barristers, advocates, solicitors, attorneys, or proctors; they had to pay double land-taxes; they could not vote for members of Parliament, or themselves be members of either House; they were barred from all civil or military posts.

It was, however, the darkness before the dawn.

CHAPTER VIII

EMANCIPATION

It was from Ireland that came the forces that produced Roman Catholic Emancipation. The extraordinary anomaly of a nation—or the immense majority of it—being forbidden to practise its religion, or to send representatives to its own Parliament except on condition of abandoning that religion, could not fail to end eventually in a crisis which would have repercussions upon England.

We have noted briefly already the signing, after the defeat of the Jacobites in Ireland, of the Limerick Treaty promising freedom to Irish Roman Catholics. The matter, however, needs to be dealt with more in detail.

The Treaty itself was a compromise. The Roman Catholics had been in arms not only for religious freedom for themselves, but also for the restoration to them of the lands confiscated by Oliver Cromwell. By the Treaty, religious liberty was guaranteed, but the alienated lands were to remain in the possession of the "planters."

The articles referring to civil liberty were important. Article II. of the Treaty granted pardon and protection to all who had served King James, on their taking an oath of allegiance in these terms: "I, A.B., do solemnly promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to their majesties King William and Queen Mary: so help me, God." Hitherto, the oath of allegiance had included an acknowledgment of the Sovereign's claim to be head of the Church, and such acknowledgment was impossible to loyal Roman Catholics; so the Treaty declared (Article IX.) that "the oath to be administered to such Roman Catholics as submit to Their Majesties' government shall be the oath aforesaid [of true allegiance] and no other." Articles III.,

IV., V., and VI. extended the privileges of the first two articles to merchants and other classes of men. Article VII. allowed Roman Catholic noblemen to carry arms and keep guns in their houses. Article VIII. gave the right of removing goods and chattels without search. Article X. guaranteed that no person who thereafter should break any of the articles should cause any other person to lose the benefit of them. Articles XI. and XII. stipulated for the ratification of the Treaty within eight months.

But—"Not a few of the Protestants were exceedingly dissatisfied because [the Roman Catholics] had obtained such large concessions. A disposition soon appeared to evade the obligations of the treaty; and, in a sermon preached on a public occasion before the Lord Justices, Dopping, the Protestant Bishop of Meath—a divine whose own career had been so very inconsistent—was so imprudent as to assert that 'the peace ought not to be observed with a people so perfidious . . . and those articles, which were intended for a security, would prove a snare'" (Killen, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, ii., 176). True, this declaration of Bishop Dopping's was resented by King William, who dismissed him from the Privy Council; but the prelate was only putting into hasty words what events were to put into deliberate action. "The victorious party saw no security but in a system of oppression, contained in a series of laws during the reigns of William and Anne, which have scarce a parallel in European history, unless it be that of the Protestants of France after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes" (Hallam, *Constitutional History of England*, seventh edition, 1854, iii., 395-396). The first sign of this, in definite legislative action, was that English statute of 1691 (3 William and Mary, chapter ii.) excluding Roman Catholics from both Houses of the Irish Parliament. Yet such exclusion had been *in effect* before 1691: for the ink was hardly dry on the Limerick Treaty before, when the Irish Parliament had met, the members of both Houses were required to take the oath against the Mass and Transubstantiation. This effectually excluded

Roman Catholics. Thereafter, the Irish Parliament, thus made a mere echo of that of England, proceeded to pass a drastic code of penal laws against Roman Catholics. By 7 William, chapter iv., no Roman Catholic (the term actually used was "Papist") was allowed to keep a school, or to teach even in a private house except to the children of that household. It was made penal, by the same Act, for Roman Catholics to send their children abroad for education: and it was declared that, when on trial on a charge of having done so, it was for the accused to prove his innocence, not for the prosecution to prove his guilt; moreover, the trial was not to be by jury. By 9 William, chapter iii., it was forbidden for Roman Catholics to marry Protestants if either party possessed an estate in Ireland; and, should such marriage occur, any children born might be taken from the Roman Catholic parent so as to ensure a Protestant education. By the same Act it was ordained that no "Papist" could be guardian of any child, but the Court of Chancery might arrange for such child's education as a Protestant. Heavy discriminations were made between Protestants and Roman Catholics in regard to land-ownership: for example, if a Roman Catholic came into possession of an estate by descent, devisement, or settlement, he must conform to the Established Church within six months, or the estate would be forfeited to the next heir being a Protestant. In direct violation of Article VII. of Limerick, the Act 7 William, chapter v., forbade any Papist to possess weapons, and allowed searches to be made for them at any time by two magistrates. Although there was no verbal prohibition of Roman Catholic worship, such prohibition was made, for all practical purposes, by 9 William, chapter i.; 2 Anne, chapter iii.; and 8 Anne, chapter iii.: which decreed that priests, bishops, and others claiming jurisdiction, and all such as should come from abroad, were to be banished (if they neglected to comply, they were to be transported as felons, and if, after banishment, they returned, they were to suffer death as traitors); that all priests were to be registered; that no priest should leave his parish; and that

informers, bringing news of violations of these statutes, should receive rewards paid with money levied from the Papists.

The mentality which produced such enactments is easy to imagine: "At the time of Anne's accession the Protestants in Ireland were only about a sixth part of the population. They were a small dominant class, holding nearly all the land, and alone eligible as members of either house of parliament. Planted amid a very naturally discontented population, they lived in a perpetual state of terror, and, with a ferocity born of fear, passed a crushing penal code against Catholicism. That the Papists would once more get the upper hand was the nightmare of the 'Protestant garrison,' for the Stuart cause was still far from hopeless—Presbyterian Scotland and Papist Ireland alike favoured the Pretender, whose claim was supported also by the powerful King of France—and until the suppression of the rebellion of 1745 there was always the possibility, and the greater or less probability, of the return of the Stuarts, with all its attendant evils" (W. S. Gregg, *Irish History*, p. 80).

During the reign of Anne the penal code reached its maximum of ferocity. It was declared to be *præmunire* to convert a Protestant to Roman Catholicism, and the penalty was imprisonment for life. Besides the Acts, already mentioned, to prevent Roman Catholic education, it was also endeavoured to prevent the ownership of land by Roman Catholics, not only by the enactment as to forfeiture for failing to conform, but also by declaring that no Papist could take a lease of more than thirty-one years, nor could he raise money on his estates. Papists were also forbidden to employ more than two apprentices in any business except the linen trade, and were legally excluded from the cities of Galway and Limerick. If a farm held by a Papist yielded one-third more than the yearly rent, any Protestant might, by simply giving sworn information that such was the case, evict the holder and receive the farm himself. If any Protestant suspected another Protestant

of holding an estate, not as his own, but in trust for a Papist, the suspected person's estate could be transferred to the other upon the latter's filing a bill against him. If a Papist wife conformed to the Established Church, she was thereby freed from her husband's control, and could claim an allowance.

With regard to priests, any who did not register was liable to the death penalty ; and the total number of registered priests was limited to 3,000. A reward of £50 was offered for the discovery of a Popish bishop (for the existence of such in Ireland was, as we have seen, illegal) ; £20 for an unregistered priest or for a friar ; and £10 for a Popish schoolmaster. These rewards produced an odious class of professional "priest-hunters." A further enactment allowed, moreover, the seizure of any Papist over the age of sixteen years ; he could be compelled to state where he had heard Mass and who was the celebrant priest ; if the priest were found to be unregistered, he was liable to the death penalty. "Still, though the registered priests died, Catholicism did not : bishops, priests, and schoolmasters continued to fulfil their duties, though by so doing they became members of the criminal classes. They lived hidden in the mountains or in the wretched cabins of the peasantry. Sometimes they were caught, imprisoned, and banished, but the people were generally very faithful to them, and the chief result of the code respecting the clergy was to create a hatred of law and foster a sympathy with crime ; nor could the clergy preach obedience to law, when by their very existence they themselves broke the law every day of their lives. It was impossible for a Catholic to obey the laws of his Church and his country, and as his conscience forced him to break some part of the law of the land, it soon permitted him to disregard others, and if he were unlucky enough to be found out and sent to gaol, there was no moral stigma attached to the name of criminal, since his religion itself was a crime" (Gregg, pp. 82-83).

It came to this : The penal laws degraded Irish Roman Catholics but promoted Roman Catholicism itself : and

the hold of the priesthood over the laity; while the penal laws themselves ultimately were traceable to fear of the power of that priesthood. A grim tangle!

Placed as the Irish "Papists" were, who can wonder at their devotion to the priesthood? With poverty and persecution all around, the poor peasants in their squalid huts had no friend save the priests: who, persecuted and hunted themselves, yet brought them the only glimpse possible to them of higher things. Priesthood and laity alike loathed many of the laws of the land. The devotion which grew up thus has been expressed beautifully by Joan Banim in a poem, *Soggarth Aroon* ("priest dear"), of which some lines may be quoted:

"Loyal and brave to you,
Soggarth aroon,
Yet I'm no slave to you,
Soggarth aroon:
Nor, out of fear to you
Stand up so near to you—
Oh, out of fear to *you*,
Soggarth aroon?

"Who, in the winter's night,
Soggarth aroon,
When the cold blast did bite,
Soggarth aroon,
Came to my cabin-door,
And, on my earthen floor,
Knelt by me, sick and poor?—
Soggarth aroon. . . .

"Oh! you and only you,
Soggarth aroon!
And for this I was true to you,
Soggarth aroon.
Our love they'll never shake,
When, for old Ireland's sake,
We a true part shall take,
Soggarth aroon!"

The Irish Roman Catholic population itself, however, was for a long period effectively crushed by the penal code. "Passed by Protestants possessing confiscated Catholic lands, its object was to impoverish, to debase, to degrade, to leave

the despoiled Catholics incapable of rebellion and ignorant of their wrongs. In this respect it succeeded. A few Catholics, with the connivance of some friendly Protestants, managed to hold their estates; the remainder gradually sank to the level of cottiers and day-labourers, living in cabins, clothed in rags, always on the verge of famine. Shut out from every position of influence, rackrented by absentee landlords, insulted by grasping agents and drunken squireens, paying tithes to a Church they abhorred, hating the Government which oppressed them and the law which made them slaves, their condition was the worst of any peasantry in Europe" (Dr. E. A. D'Alton, in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, viii., 105-106). It is said that nearly half a million of the flower of the youth enlisted in foreign armies between 1691 and 1745, and thus often came into conflict with England on the Continent of Europe.

Crushing restrictions, also, were placed on Irish trade. The wool industry was the form of manufacture in which Ireland still was able to excel. Ten years after the accession of William and Mary: "A Parliament was summoned in Dublin, in September 1698, for the express purpose of destroying the Irish industry. The Irish Parliament was then, from the nature of its constitution, completely subservient to English influence, and, had it been otherwise, it would have had no power to resist. The Lords Justices in their opening speech urged the House to encourage the linen and hempen manufacture instead of the woollen manufacture, which England desired to monopolise. The Commons in reply promised their hearty endeavours to establish a linen and hempen manufacture in Ireland, expressed a hope that they might find 'such a temperament' in respect to the woollen trade as would prevent it being injurious to that of England, and proceeded, at the instance of the Government, to impose heavy additional duties on the export of Irish woollen goods. The English, however, were still unsatisfied. The Irish woollen manufacturers had already been excluded by the Navigation Act from the whole colonial market; they had been virtually ex-

cluded from England itself, by duties amounting to prohibition (12 Charles II., chapter iv., and afterwards 11 George I., chapter vii.). A law of crushing severity, enacted by the British Parliament in 1699, completed the work and prohibited the Irish from exporting their manufactured wool to any other country whatever (10 and 11 William, chapter x.)" (Lecky, *Ireland in Eighteenth Century*, i. 176-177). With regard to the promise to encourage two other industries in substitution for that of wool: "The Irish linen manufacture was undoubtedly encouraged by bounties, but not until 1743, when the country had sunk into a condition of appalling wretchedness. In spite of the compact of 1698, the hempen manufacture was so discouraged that it positively ceased. Disabling duties were imposed on Irish sailcloth imported into England. Irish check, striped, and dyed linens were absolutely excluded from the colonies. They were virtually excluded from England by the imposition of a duty of 30 per cent., and Ireland was not allowed to participate in the bounties granted for the exportation of these descriptions of linen from Great Britain to foreign countries" (Lecky, i., 179).

In 1723 was a potato famine, with terrible consequences in the starvation of a peasantry reduced to the lowest limit of subsistence. A still worse one blighted the land in 1746. In 1759 there were riots in Dublin, arising from rumours that the Irish Parliament was to be abolished and incorporated with that of England. In 1761 came the Whiteboy Insurrection.

The Whiteboys were a secret society whose professed aim was the restoration of lands to ancient proprietors. They proceeded by means of terror. "In some cases the Whiteboys acted with all the audacity of open insurgents. Great bodies of men traversed the country, often in the open daylight, wearing white cockades and blowing horns. In several cases they awaited an encounter with soldiers. They broke open the gaol at Tralee and released the prisoners. They threatened to burn the town of Newmarket, in the diocese of Cloyne, unless a Whiteboy con-

fined there was released. They burnt several houses which soldiers had occupied" (Lecky, ii., 21). The Whiteboys were an agrarian, rather than a religious-sectarian, body; their ranks included many Protestants or men of no creed. "In some districts large bodies of men appeared on market day on the roads round some country town, or on Sundays near the chapel doors, compelling all who passed to swear to obey the laws and future commands of Captain Right. Many fictitious names were attached to the Whiteboy proclamations, but that of Captain Right soon predominated, and it became more powerful in Munster, and in many counties of Leinster, than King or Viceroy or Parliament" (Lecky, ii., 24). The 1761 rising was suppressed, but another followed—also in the southern counties—some years later (in 1786); and in 1787 an Act was passed by which, "if it were established by the evidence of a single witness that an illegal oath had been tendered in, or adjoining to, a Popish chapel, that chapel should be at once destroyed and its materials sold, and that if within the space of three years any new Catholic place of worship was erected in the same parish it also should be destroyed" (Lecky, ii., 457).

The Oakboys were a Protestant secret society in the northern counties, also acting by terror. Its objects were opposition to tithes and to a Road Act which ordered that all roads should be repaired by the personal labour of the householders. In 1763 they rose in Armagh, Tyrone, Derry, and Fermanagh, but the rising was easily repressed.

Another Ulster Protestant secret society was that of the Steelboys. It consisted of tenants rendered desperate by ejection from their homes or farms. In 1768 they rose in several Ulster counties, but were repressed. Many were executed, but thousands fled to America.

The Defenders and the Peep-o'-Day Boys were a Roman Catholic and a Protestant (mainly Presbyterian) secret society respectively, and were in constant conflict. The Peep-o'-Day Boys had for their professed object the disarming of the Roman Catholics according to law. The

Defenders were animated by a general desire to defend the Roman Catholics. The Peep-o'-Day Boys, though using an Act of Parliament as their pretext, would commit general outrages on their opponents, whose houses they would invade "as dawn was peeping"; and the Defenders retaliated with equal bitterness. The conflicts were especially bitter in 1795.

When one ponders these calamitous social conditions, one can see that, lamentable though they were, they were the inevitable result of policies which gave the lands of a native population to planters from over the water, and which ground down the majority of that population by special laws. Secret societies and outrages on both sides were the logical consequence. Yet, when we consider matters more deeply still, we recognise that the ultimate cause of conflict had been fear of an imperialistic religious power which had seemed to identify religion with sedition and persecution. A grim tangle!

In 1775 broke out the War of American Independence, wafting across the ocean the breath of battles for liberty. In the same year Henry Grattan entered the Irish Parliament. Grattan—born in Dublin, July 1746—was a son of James Grattan, Recorder of that city. Henry, after taking his B.A. degree of Trinity College, went to London to study law, but he had long felt more interest in politics; indeed, his progressive ideas estranged his father from him and caused him to leave the family estate away from his son when he died in 1766. In 1775 Lord Charlemont offered him the seat in the Irish Parliament, which had been rendered vacant by the drowning of Francis Caulfield. (It will be borne in mind that in those days Parliamentary seats, both in England and in Ireland, were largely "pocket" property, both as to elections and as to subsequent Parliamentary proceedings.)

It was now time for definite action for the repeal of penal laws on religion; but we may ask, What, while all these things had been going on in Ireland, had become of the Roman Catholics of England?

From 1629 to 1685 there had been in England no resident Roman Catholic bishop. In the latter year, however, the Pope, at the request of King James II., nominated four bishops *in partibus infidelium* to be Vicars-Apostolic of that number of districts—London, the Midlands, the North, and the West—into which, for Roman Catholic purposes, England was divided. The first holders of these posts were Drs. Leyburn, Gifford, Smith, and Ellis. These Vicariates-Apostolic were continued, in uninterrupted succession, during all the penal times after the Revolution of 1688.

"The life of a Catholic bishop [in England] during the first half of the eighteenth century was not an enviable one. The new penal laws which were brought into force were designed to stamp out the Catholic religion without having recourse to the barbarous methods of former times. Priests were subject to fines and imprisonment, but were no longer to be put to death. In order to make the laws operate more surely, a reward of £100 was offered, which could be claimed by any 'informer' on obtaining the conviction of a priest. There was therefore every inducement to a renegade Catholic, who knew the manner of concealment commonly practised, to turn 'informer' and claim the reward. During the first part of the eighteenth century the penal laws were frequently carried into execution, and although after a time they began to fall into disuse, the Stuart rising of 1745 was the signal for their revival, and it was not until some time after this that they began to fall finally into abeyance" (Bishop Ward, *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England*, 1909, i., Introduction, p. xxiv).

Bishop Leyburn died in 1702, and was succeeded, in his Vicariate of London, by Bishop Giffard : transferred from the Midland district. He lived to be ninety-two, and, when he died, in 1734, was followed, in the Vicariate, by his assistant, Bishop Benjamin Petre. As assistant, Dr. Petre himself chose the celebrated Dr. Challoner.

Richard Challoner was born on September 29, 1691, the son of a wine-cooper (a Presbyterian by religion) of

Lewes in Sussex. His father dying, the widow became housekeeper to the Roman Catholic family of Gage, in Firle, Sussex. She and her son Richard became Roman Catholics when he was thirteen years old. Richard went to Douai College in 1705, and spent twenty-five years there; as student, then a professor, and finally as vice-president. He was ordained priest in 1716. With little originality of thought, he was deeply pious, extremely industrious, and wholly devoted to his work. In 1728 he published *Think Well on't*, a book of spiritual meditation. Two years later he was sent on the London mission. "Though the penal laws were no longer enforced with extreme severity, the life of the Catholic priest was still a hard one. Disguised as a layman, Dr. Challoner ministered to the small number of Catholics, celebrating Mass secretly in obscure ale-houses, cockpits, and wherever small gatherings could assemble without exciting remark" (Mgr. Edwin Burton, in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, iii., 564). He entered into controversy. In a preface to a work entitled *The Catholic Christian Instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice, and Ceremonies of the Church*, he criticised an attack made on Roman Catholicism by Dr. Conyers Middleton. The result was that he had to leave England to escape the hands of the law. He soon returned, and was ordained a bishop *in partibus* in 1741. Bishop Petre dying in 1758, Dr. Challoner succeeded him. To give an idea of the task of a Roman Catholic bishop in England in those days, it may be mentioned not only that Dr. Challoner's presence in England at all was illegal, but also that the districts, over which he was to minister to his scattered flock, included ten English counties, the Channel Islands, and the then British possessions in America—Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the British West Indies. In 1740 he published one book which alone would have made his name ever-famous and ever-beloved—*The Garden of the Soul*. Who can estimate the priceless value which, in its many subsequent editions, that prayer book has had for thousands—indeed, hundreds of thousands—of English-speaking

Roman Catholics? He also compiled *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*: a record of the seminarists, a kind of Roman Catholic *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. Another work of his, which has been of priceless value, was the preparation of his edition of the Douai and Rheims Bible. English Roman Catholics thus possessed a substitute for the Anglican Authorised Version. He wrote in 1733 *A Short History of the Protestant Religion*; in 1734, *A Roman Catholick's Reasons Why He cannot Conform*; in 1751, *A Papist Misrepresented and Represented*; in 1760, *A Caveat against the Methodists*; and was author of many other controversial and devotional works. He died in 1781, after a life of busy zeal, devotion and piety. His illustrious name is one of the most treasured in the annals of English Roman Catholicism since the Reformation.

It was, even apart from vexatious penal laws, a depressing time altogether. The eighteenth century has left the reputation of indifferentism. The Roman Catholic community here shared in that defect. "The greater part of the rank-and-file of the Catholicly-minded population had either followed the bad example of the landlords [about two-thirds of the formerly Roman Catholic nobility had conformed to the Established Church] or, where the chapels of the nobility had been given up, had succumbed to the deprivation of the sacraments and the inability to practise their religion. Unquestionably, they made very indifferent Protestants. Religion was never at a lower ebb than in the England to which Wesley preached. But they and their children had ceased to put up any fight in behalf of the Church of their forefathers, and very soon they had lost all memory of its tenets and retained nothing of its distinctive devotional practices" (Rev. H. Thurston, S.J., *The Darkness before the Dawn*, pp. 3-4).

In Challoner's "London district" (Middlesex, Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Hants, Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, Essex, and Hertfordshire) there were about 25,000 Roman Catholics, mostly in London. In the "Midland district" the number was approximately 8,500. In the "Western

district" (which included Wales) there were some 3,000. In the "Northern district" the Roman Catholic population was about 20,000. "Lancashire was then, as now, by far the most Catholic county in England; but in most places in the North there were to be found numerous families who had never lost the faith" (Ward, *Dawn of Catholic Revival*, i., p. xxvi). The political cause called Jacobitism was dead towards the end of the eighteenth century, and the English Roman Catholics had mostly ceased to take any interest in it or its memory.

On the death of Bishop Challoner, he was succeeded by Bishop James Talbot. This was shortly after the passage—1778—of the first Roman Catholic Relief Bill. A change had come over the outlook of the governing classes of England. Even so early as 1700 there had been a good deal of dislike of the penal laws; as is shown by such documents as a letter from James Verney, Secretary of State, to the Duke of Shrewsbury, February 8 of that year (see *Letters illustrative of the Reign of William the Third*, 1841, ii., 429):

"There was another motion yesterday by Mr. Hammond for appointing a committee to inquire how far the laws have been put in execution against Papists; to which was added a direction to inspect the said laws, and report their opinion of them; as also to propose what further remedies were necessary for suppressing the growth of Popery and strengthening the Protestant religion. The design of the motion was to charge the Government with remissness; and that by the carelessness of the Administration the kingdom swarmed with priests. But, on the other hand, it was shown that the greater severity of the laws hindered the execution of them; that putting people to death merely for their religion was generally condemned by Protestants, and disliked by Englishmen; and if sanguinary laws were changed into other punishments they would have more effect; and the House seemed to be very much of this opinion. And I hope they may find out ways to be rid of priests, and to breed up the children of Papists in the Protestant religion."

Even in 1700, then, there was opposition to the penal laws; but, nevertheless, even that opposition was as to the *nature* of the laws, not as to their *intention*. That Roman Catholics, as such, should be recognised as citizens like anyone else, was not dreamt of; but, by the end of the century, the prevailing spirit of religious indifferentism had tended towards producing even *that* result. In fact, the century witnessed the growth of the penal laws to their grim maximum, and that maximum producing an impossibility of maintaining them at all. George I. came to the throne in 1714, and, in his very first year as king, a statute was passed obliging all Papists to take an oath of allegiance to the Hanoverian succession, on pain of forfeiture of goods. After the Stuart rising of 1715, an Act was passed appointing commissioners to inquire into all Popish recusants' estates, with the design of confiscating two-thirds of each estate. In 1722 an Act was passed "to grant an aid to His Majesty by levying a tax upon Papists." Under that statute no less than £100,000 was raised from the "Papists," already driven almost to desperation. During the reign of George II. (1727-1760), no further stringency was added to the penal laws. It would hardly have been possible! In that of George III. (1760-1820) began the process of repeal.

When that process began, there can be little doubt that—so far as England is concerned—the idea of tolerating Roman Catholicism was argued for mainly on the ground that it was too feeble to be feared. The worthy Sidney Smith, Dean of St. Paul's, for example, in his satirical *Peter Plymley's Letters* "on the subject of the Catholics," said: "I am as disgusted by the nonsense of the Roman Catholic religion as you can be: and no man who talks such nonsense shall ever tithe the product of the earth; nor meddle with the ecclesiastical establishment in any shape"; but he added: "What have I to do with the speculative nonsense of this theology, when the object is to elect the mayor of a county town, or to appoint a colonel of a marching regiment? Will a man discharge the solemn impertinences of the one office with less zeal, or shrink from

the bloody boldness of the other with greater timidity, because the blockhead thinks he can eat angels in muffins, and chew a spiritual nature in the crumpets which he buys from the baker's shop? I am sorry there should be such impious folly in the world, but I should be ten times a greater fool than he is, if I refused to lead him out against the enemies of the State till he had made a solemn protestation that the crumpet was spiritless, and the muffin nothing but a human muffin." Then "Peter Plymley" went on to ridicule his supposititious, simple "Brother Abraham's" fears of the "Papists": "In the first place, my sweet Abraham, the Pope is not landed—nor are there any curates sent out after him—nor has he been hid at St. Albans by the Dowager Lady Spencer—nor dined privately at Holland House—nor been seen near Dropmore. . . . Though the Pope is probably hovering about our coast in a fishing-smack, it is most likely he will fall a prey to the vigilance of our cruisers; and it is certain he has not yet polluted the Protestantism of our soil."

It is true, the liberal sentiments of "Peter Plymley" were opposed by other writers. For example, in a pamphlet entitled *Brother Abraham's Answer to Peter Plymley, Esq.* (London, Cradock and Joy, 1808; see British Museum Reading Room, 3939e, 3, 2), an anonymous writer (but Dr. Smith himself also was anonymous at the time, as regards the Plymley letters) said: "You and your new school abhor and detest our present state of society, because we do not pay equal regard to all creeds. Now, I think it rather necessary to make some little distinctions. Suppose, for instance, a man, instead of saying, 'I believe in God,' should say, 'I believe in the devil and Buonaparte.' I think such a fellow as this would not deserve any plums out of the pudding; and I think this ought to be considered as 'a *jobless faith*, a creed that should doom a man through life to a lean and *plunderless integrity.*'" He argued thus for retaining the penal laws: "Now, Master Peter, if you say that the farmer ought to grub up his hedge, because it is no fence to winged animals, you are the greatest goose of

the two, for the hedge is still a good fence against all animals without wings; therefore let the hedge alone, if you are not so very stupid as to risk the destruction of all your crops."

It is needful—if we wish to understand history—to put ourselves mentally in the place of those who actually lived in, and did the actions of, the times we are considering. The truth about the anti-"Papist" penal laws, then, is this: They were enacted as self-defence against a power, and the allies of a power, which aimed at the destruction of the State as constituted independently of it, and which would have replaced those penal laws with even worse ones; they were continued under a sense of the perils of that power and its allies; and they were repealed gradually, partly from a sense of their needlessness any longer, and partly in order to avoid civil war.

At the end of the eighteenth century, though Roman Catholic places of worship were illegal, they were tolerated in the residences of the ambassadors of foreign Roman Catholic powers: those residences being considered extra-territorial. "It would appear that English Catholics were usually allowed to attend the services without molestation; but as the 'chapels' were theoretically for the use of foreigners, it was forbidden to have sermons in English, and this law was often enforced for long periods of time, by means of representations to the ambassador on the part of the English Government. Beyond these few chapels, nothing was to be found either in London or in the provincial towns but a few 'Mass-houses' scattered here and there, which had an intermittent and always precarious existence" (Bishop Ward, *Catholic London a Century Ago*, 1905, p. 4). So far as Roman Catholicism was able to continue at all, it depended on the support of the remaining Roman Catholic aristocrats. "In England the Catholics were a small remnant, grouped for the most part round certain old families who provided chapels in their own mansions for the very few Catholics of the neighbourhood" (Denis Gwynn, *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation*, 1928, p. 3).

Even that small remnant was torn with dissensions. The eighteenth century was highly sceptical; it is not surprising that the English Roman Catholics were affected by that spirit. The aristocrats tended to exalt the importance of the laity, and to minimise that of the clergy and the Pope. The Catholic Committee was formed in June, 1782. The first Roman Catholic Relief Act ("Sir George Saville's Act") had been passed four years previously. *The Annual Register for* 1778 (pp. *189 *190) referred to it thus: "The lateness of the season did not prevent Sir George Saville from endeavouring to profit of the lenient temper and liberal spirit of the times, in favour of a long-oppressed body of men, almost forgotten in the patience and silence with which for many years they endured their grievances. However necessary the penal laws against Roman Catholics originally were, whilst the Constitution was yet struggling into reformation, and afterwards confirming itself in that happy settlement, as the cause of persecution had long ceased to operate, men of humanity could not avoid lamenting—as all true policy forbade—the keeping up of such standing memorials of civil rancour and discord, and perpetuating a line of division by which one part of the people, being cut off from the rights of citizens, could scarcely be said to possess any share in the common interest, and were rendered incapable of forming any part of the common union of defence." The Saville Act, however, merely enabled Roman Catholics to inherit and purchase land and repealed the Act which offered rewards for the discovery of priests. The second Relief Act (1791) relieved from the operation of the penal code all Roman Catholics who took an oath (there was controversy as to its wording, but ultimately the oath used in Ireland was adopted) of allegiance to the Crown and repudiation of foreign jurisdiction: also especially of loyalty to the House of Brunswick and repudiation of the Pope's deposing power.

Between the passing of these two Acts, however, had occurred the awful Gordon Riots of 1780. The con-

cessions of 1778, and prospects of others, roused the fury and panic of the populace in London (there was no popular education then). The semi-insane Lord George Gordon fomented the storm. The contemporary *Annual Register* for 1780 said (p. 214): "June 2.—This day the petition of the Protestant Association was presented to Parliament; and in the evening the dreadful riots and conflagrations commenced, which continued, without intermission, to the eighth." One passage from the *Register* (pp. 261-262) is sufficient as description: "As soon as the day [the 7th] was drawing to a close, one of the most dreadful spectacles this country ever beheld was exhibited. Let those, who were not spectators of it, judge what the inhabitants felt when they beheld at the same instant the flames ascending and rolling in clouds from the King's Bench and Fleet Prisons, from New Bridewell, from the toll-gates on Blackfriars Bridge (the toll-gates at Blackfriars appear to have been burnt for the sake of plunder; some lives were lost there, and one man, who was shot, ran thirty or forty yards before he dropped), from houses in every quarter of the town, and particularly from the bottom and middle of Holborn, where the conflagration was horrible beyond description. The houses that were first set on fire at this last-mentioned place both belonged to Mr. Langdale, an eminent distiller, and contained immense quantities of spirituous liquors. Six and thirty fires, all blazing at one time, and in different quarters of the city, were to be seen from one spot. During the whole night men, women, and children, were running up and down with such goods and effects as they wished most to preserve. The tremendous roar of the authors of these horrible scenes was heard at one instant, and, at the next, the dreadful reports of soldiers' musquets, firing in platoons, and from different quarters: in short, everything served to impress the mind with ideas of universal anarchy and approaching desolation." The riots, however, had no permanent effect in preventing Roman Catholic Emancipation.

The disunion—already referred to—of English Roman Catholics in those days, needs to be appreciated fully. The aristocrat laymen had formed the Catholic Committee (secretary, Charles Butler: a nephew of the Rev. Alban Butler, the author of *The Lives of the Saints*), but its members took a "Cisalpine" view: exalting the power of the laity and lessening that of Pope and clergy. They were willing to make large concessions to the State in return for Emancipation. "With this Committee the responsible ministers, including such well-known names as Pitt, Fox, Wyndham, and others, treated, as though they were the only representatives of the Catholic body. And once the Committeemen had cut themselves off, in their public action, from their ecclesiastical rulers, their lack of theological training [?=lack of clerical point of view] soon led them into unsound regions further than they realised or knew. They asserted that the strict attitude, assumed by the Vicars-Apostolic, was un-English, and traced the evils they complained of to the too-close intercourse with the Roman Curia, who, they contended, did not understand the circumstances of Protestant England. For this reason they agitated for a proper Hierarchy [of Roman Catholic bishops, with local territorial titles], 'so that this frequent recurrence to Rome might cease'; while some of them even went so far as to claim their right to elect their own bishops. An anti-Papal attitude was the natural accompaniment of views such as these" (Ward, *Catholic London a Century Ago*, pp. 14-15). One of the most resolute opponents of the Committee was the celebrated controversialist Milner.

John Milner had been a *protégé* of Bishop Challoner, who sent him to Douai College, where he was ordained in 1777, and whence he was then sent to the English mission. When the conflicts with the Catholic Committee began, he was theological adviser to the four Vicars-Apostolic. Milner was noted as a controversial writer: his best-known work now is *The End of Religious Controversy*, but he wrote also *Divine Rights of Episcopacy* (1791), *Audi Alteram Partem* (1792), *A History of Winchester* (1798), *Brief Life of*

Challoner (same year), and many other works. In the Catholic Committee matter he took up a very high "no compromise" attitude. As we shall see, neither his nor the Committee's attitude affected the final issue of the negotiations for Emancipation; but Milner's stand for Ultramontanism had a great effect on the internal development of the Roman Catholic Church in England. He was made Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland district in 1803; but he did not live to see Emancipation: he died on April 19, 1826.

When he became Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland district, Milner began to write violent controversial attacks on the faults, as he deemed them, of the administration of the London district, of which the nominal Vicar was Dr. Douglass, but, he being in ill-health, the real one was his coadjutor, Dr. William Poynter. Dr. Poynter had been a Douai student and, with other collegians, had endured over a year's imprisonment during the French Revolution. He came to England in 1795, and took a leading part in the foundation of the St. Edmund's theological college in Hertfordshire: he was first vice-president and then president. When he came to London to be Bishop Douglass's assistant, he endured Milner's attacks in silence, but when Milner went so far as to appeal to Rome against him, he had to defend himself. The Pope ordered Milner to stop attacking Poynter, under pain of being deposed. Poynter, like his great opponent, died (September, 1827) before Emancipation. However, the famous old church—now pulled down—of St. Mary's, Moorfields, London, was built and opened in his episcopate. "We can well imagine the feelings of priests and people on that opening day, April 20, 1820. The elderly ones among them could remember the old chapel in Ropemakers' Alley, and the anxieties and troubles of the Riots. Those well on in middle life had had personal experience of England under the penal laws. It was hardly a generation ago since it was unsafe to use the word Mass, and many of the elder ones still preserved the custom of

speaking of it as 'prayers.' And now they were celebrating the holy mysteries in the full light of day, and in a church which any country might have been proud to possess. Dr. Poynter pontificated and himself preached the sermon, and we can enter into his feelings of joy on that day" (Ward, *Catholic London a Century Ago*, pp. 192-193). But this is an anticipation.

With regard to Scotland, in the chapter on the Reformation there, it has been remarked that there were few *martyrdoms*, deaths for the Roman Catholic religion. "Though in Scotland there were fewer martyrdoms than in England or Ireland, yet the persecution fell even more heavily on the rank and file of Catholics, and in some respects they suffered outrage not paralleled in England, such as the simultaneous expulsion of all Catholics from their homes, which was ordered and carried out in 1629-1630. But there were times of comparative tranquillity when the rigour of the law was not enforced" (Mgr. Edwin Burton, in *Catholic Encyclopædia*, xi., 614). There were some penal laws confined to Scotland: as, for example, the penalty of five hundred merks for a Papist's teaching "any art, science, or exercise of any sort." In 1726 there were two Vicars-Apostolic, one for the Lowlands and the other for the Highlands (where Roman Catholics were numerous). The English Roman Catholic Relief Bill of 1777 produced a violent outbreak of popular fury against Roman Catholics in Scotland, but a law of 1793 released them from many disabilities. In 1780 there were about 25,000 "Papists" in Scotland.

Ireland, it was, however, whence Emancipation was to come for the Roman Catholics of all three countries. We have seen the deplorable state into which Ireland had sunk under the penal laws: poverty, misery, and mutual wars of secret societies. As but one example of the nature of those wars, we may quote this (see *Reply to Doctor Caulfield*; pamphlet published by Marchbank, Dublin, 1802; British Museum 3939c 3, 1; pp. 48-50):

"I will give a short account of the suffering of the

Rev. Mr. Francis, rector [Established Church] of Killegny, in the county of Wexford, a gentleman venerable for his age, his piety, and learning. . . . He was plundered of his horses, bridles, saddles, provisions, wearing-apparel, arms and ammunition. He was repeatedly threatened with death, unless he would admit a priest, and change his religion. . . . He received domiciliary visits, daily, from the savage pikemen, who frequently asked him,Whether he had the protection of a priest? . . . At last, one Bryan, a rebel captain, and a man of some humanity, feeling pity for his sufferings, went to the rebel camp, and procured from General Roche, the priest, over whom he had great influence, a protection for him, which I give the reader: '*A protection for the Rev. Mr. Francis.*—It is ordered that no person or persons shall dare insult, abuse, injure or hurt the Rev. Mr. Francis, his family, domesticks, mansion-house, etc. All who disobey these orders shall be taken by a guard, brought into camp, to be tried by a court-martial, and punished according to their sentence.—ROCHE, *Commander-in-Chief of the united republican army of the county of Wexford.*' "

This was during the great rising of "the '98" ("Who fears to speak of '98?"!): but the '98 was only an extreme outburst of what was going on all the time. The land was torn with warfare of rival gangs, and the religion of the majority of the people was penalised by law. It could not continue: more especially when from America and from France came news of nations breaking their fetters.

In 1791 the Ulster Presbyterians had founded the Society of United Irishmen, to secure Parliamentary reform and Roman Catholic Emancipation. Nevertheless, the Irish Parliament, dominated by anti-"Papist" vested interests, did nothing until pressure from England compelled it to pass, in 1792, an Act admitting Roman Catholics to the Bar, legalising marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and allowing Roman Catholics to set up schools.

In December of 1792, the Irish Catholic Committee called in Dublin a Convention of representatives from all

parts of Ireland: its opponents scornfully called it the "Back Lane Parliament." It sent delegates to England; they made representations to the Government; and Dundas, the Home Secretary, declared that the time had come for concessions. Next year the Irish Parliament passed an Act giving Roman Catholics the franchise and making them eligible for admission to Dublin University and to public offices: but continuing their exclusion from Parliament and from being King's Counsel.

In 1795 Earl Fitzwilliam was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He initiated a conciliatory policy, but the state of the country—devastated by Defenders, Peep-o'-Day Boys, etc.—was desperate. In 1798 came the Rising. It was crushed; and two years later the Irish Parliament was abolished and incorporated with that of Great Britain. As the old Parliament had been a Protestant body, and hopelessly corrupt, the union was welcomed by many Roman Catholics: Pitt, the Premier, having promised that it should be followed by Roman Catholic Emancipation. However, the opposition of King George III. made it impossible to fulfil the promise. The Irish Roman Catholics, therefore, entered upon an alternation of struggle and negotiation which was to continue for almost another generation.

Pitt died in 1806, and Lord Granville's "Ministry of All the Talents" was formed. It resigned when the king refused to sanction a measure to admit Roman Catholics to the army and navy. The Duke of Portland formed a ministry on the basis of resistance to the Roman Catholic claims. In 1812, however, Lord Liverpool became Premier, and Canning's motion in favour of Emancipation was carried: but it was merely a resolution expressive of opinion, having no legislative force. In the following year Grattan, now a member of the United Parliament, introduced a Bill which would have legalised Emancipation on a basis of recognising the Government's claim of a veto over appointments of Roman Catholic prelates. The Bill failed to pass.

Meanwhile, a curious complication of an already sufficiently complicated problem had occurred. The Pope, Pius VII., was absent from Rome, a prisoner of Buonaparte. Mgr. Quarantotti, the Vice-President of the College of Propaganda at Rome, was vested with powers of administration, and he sent to England a letter approving the veto. Immense dismay was caused thereby in the ranks of the Irish and English Roman Catholic prelates. On returning to Rome, however, the Pope cancelled Mgr. Quarantotti's pro-veto pronouncement.

In 1817 Parliament passed an Act admitting Roman Catholics to the army and navy. Daniel O'Connell, the great agitator (the term is not derogatory; he would have gloried in it), this year began his campaign in favour of unconditional Emancipation.

In 1820 George III. died and was succeeded by George IV. Grattan died in the same year.

In 1823 O'Connell founded the Catholic Association in Ireland. It was this formidable organisation which really gained the victory for the Emancipation movement. It was organised on a parochial basis throughout Ireland, and a minimum subscription paid by each member was called "the Catholic rent." The organisation became so powerful that it challenged the authority of the State, and in 1825 the Government passed an Act suppressing it.

O'Connell, however, as an ingenious lawyer, was equal to the emergency. He had always aimed at keeping within the letter of the laws of the State, even whilst defying the State. In fact, his policy was one of "legal illegality." "The Government had thrown its net as widely as possible, to prevent the formation of any new Association whatever which would represent the whole Catholic body. But one large loophole had inevitably remained. The Act was expressly exempted from applying to any society organised for charitable purposes. Evasion was so simple a matter that O'Connell at once announced that the new Association would retain almost the same title as the old. The 'New Catholic Association' was to be formed for the

entirely legal purpose 'of public or private charity, and such other purposes as are not prohibited by the statute of George IV., cap. 4'" (Denis Gwynn, *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation*, p. 230). In 1826 came the great election in Waterford, where the Catholic Association secured the defeat of Lord George Beresford, although the Beresford family had had possession of the seat so long as to regard it as their appanage.

The Duke of Wellington became Prime Minister in 1828, and, in the same year, came the famous Clare election, when the Catholic Association demonstrated its power, even more emphatically than at Waterford, by securing the election of O'Connell.

The next year came victory. The King's Speech announced a policy of concession: although only recently that idea had been scouted. The Bill removing all remaining disabilities on Roman Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland (except a few restrictions such as those on Jesuits and other religious orders) was passed, and George IV., after painful scenes of resistance, gave the Royal Assent. (The quaint form of the Bill was that of replacing prohibitive oaths by innocuous ones.)

The penal code was gone; but the historian must ask: What was the root cause of it? Subsidiary causes there were in many: greed to seize, and keep, Church possessions; bigotry on both sides; these and many other factors contributed, but the root cause of anti-"Papist" penal laws is found in the social theory which prevailed in the Middle Ages and expressed itself in Boniface VIII.'s Bull *Unam Sanctam*: "The two swords, spiritual and temporal, are both in the power of the Church: the first to be wielded *by* the Church, the other *for* the Church: the first by the priests, the other by kings and soldiers, but at the beck and permission of the priest."

That was the theory which prevailed in the Middle Ages, so far as the Roman See could make it prevail. It brought, it is true, some semblance of unity into the chaos of the Dark Ages which followed the fall of the Western Roman

Empire; but, being based on intellectual and religious intolerance, it had in its very foundation a fatal defect. The progress of the human mind would make the theory untenable; yet freedom from it would be unattainable save by a deadly conflict, involving the enactment of persecuting laws by the very people who were struggling for their own freedom from such laws. Strange irony!—yet the result is to show the futility of all such laws, and to establish freedom of conscience as a natural right.

CHAPTER IX

AFTER EMANCIPATION

When the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829, obtained after so much struggle, emancipated members of that Church, in these islands, from their fetters, the prospects before them, it is true—at least, in Great Britain—were not such as to inspire much confidence in the future, save that of ability now to live unmolested the quiet life of an obscure sect. "When the nineteenth century opened, the Catholics of Great Britain were, to quote Cardinal Newman's words, 'a *gens lucifuga*, found in corners and alleys and cellars and the housetops, or in the recesses of the country.' Their chapels were few and far between, and were purposely placed in quarters where they were unlikely to attract observation. It was common to locate them in mews, and in their exterior they were hardly distinguishable from the adjoining stables" (W. S. Lilly, in *Catholic Encyclopædia*, v., 454).

The passing of the Emancipation Act was interesting in another way: namely, as a contrast to what was being enacted at that very time in Rome itself—then not only the seat of the Supreme Pontiff, but also the capital of the States of the Church. "A general edict of the Holy See of Rome, dated the 14th of May, orders every person to give information to the Inquisition as to all heretics, or those who are suspected of being so. In this category there are ranged all individuals who treat with doubt the worship of the Virgin or the Saints; who believe in the dissolubility of marriage; who hold intercourse with Jews or heretics; who oppose themselves to the acts of the Holy Inquisition, or take part in abusing the informers that it welcomes and rewards, and who possess books of heretical authors, or

discuss religious matters without the authority of the Holy See. By this edict, it is forbidden to every Catholic to hold any intercourse, or even to eat, with Jews, or to suckle or educate their children, or render them any service whatever" (*The Gentleman's Magazine*, London, 1829, p. 69).

The place, however, to deal with such contrarieties, is not in this chapter, so that one example may be merely noted as we pass on to consider the condition of Roman Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland after Emancipation. And first, as to Ireland.

"The Emancipation Act of 1829," as Lilly and Wallis (*Manual of Law affecting Catholics*, 1893, p. 46) truly said, "was not only a relieving, but also a disabling Act." Its clauses directed towards the suppression of "religious orders of men," however, were never put into execution; and for all practical purposes the Roman Catholics of these islands were legally on the same footing as any other Church.

The condition of Ireland, immediately after the passing of the Emancipation Act, was the reverse of promising for a peaceable future. "All the accounts from Ireland," said *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1829, pp. 70-71, "continue to be of the most alarming nature. One from Armagh, dated the 18th of July, states the county is dreadfully disturbed, and that nothing has ever been witnessed like it since the great Rebellion of 1798. At a battle fought at Glenoe, four Orangemen were killed, and six or seven Catholics, besides a great number wounded. The county of Down is greatly agitated; at Miltown, 2,000 people drove the barrister, the court, and the police, out of the town. In the county of Leitrim, handbills have been circulated, calling upon the Roman Catholic peasantry, in the name of the King who granted them Emancipation, to repair to Fermanagh to assist their friends. At Manor Hamilton, co. Leitrim, a regular attack was made on the Protestants by the Papists. The Protestants were compelled to take arms to defend themselves. The Popish leaders frequently called out to rally their men, exclaiming to them that it was for their 'religion they were fighting.' A ballad-singer was paraded

by the Papists, to sing forth the glories of Mr. O'Connell, and this was made the pretext for beginning the affray. In many parts of Ulster the Orange exhibitions were celebrated on the 13th and 14th, the challenge thrown in the teeth of the Catholics accepted, battle given, and lives unhappily lost. In Fermanagh, some of the intelligence received makes the killed and wounded on both sides upwards of twenty men. The *Fermanagh Reporter* states, that on Monday the 13th inst. a vast crowd of persons assembled at Derrylin, seven miles from Enniskillen. Lord Enniskillen repaired to the spot, but, although aided by the Priest, he could not disperse the people. About 800 men, armed with pikes, scythes on poles, pitchforks, etc., attacked the Protestant party, killed a man who had advanced to make peace, and wounded seven others mortally. A considerable number were killed and wounded on the other side. The rebels, to the amount of some thousands, formed an encampment on Benaughlen mountain. On the evening of the 2nd July inst. a man named McCabe was waylaid by some Popish fiends, on his way homewards from the market of Carrickmacross, county of Monaghan, and most savagely murdered. This victim was offered up on the altar of Popish intolerance, on account of his having read his recantation, and abandoned the errors of Popery for conscience sake. In order to make this the more apparent, the sanguinary barbarians actually *cut out the tongue* of this new martyr in the cause of civil and religious liberty. On the 18th of July, the Irish Government issued a proclamation against meetings of a religious or political tendency. It stated, in the preamble, 'meetings of large numbers of His Majesty's subjects have lately been held, for the avowed purpose of commemorating political events, or for the manifestation of particular opinions, political or religious; as also for the purpose of resisting, by violent and illegal means, such commemoration or manifestation.' It concludes with expressing a determination 'to put down and suppress such meetings, and to prevent the recurrence thereof.'"

In dealing with the history of struggles in Ireland, in fact, we can never view them as either wholly religious or wholly racial. Both elements are intermixed. The conflicts of race were sanctioned with the authority of religion; the conflicts of religions were animated with the hates of race. In this work it would be out of place to treat of the political struggle with England which was destined to continue till 1921. All that can be done is to chronicle some outstanding events in religious development.

On Tuesday, July 19, 1831, there was held at Maynooth College, co. Kildare (founded in 1795 for the education of Roman Catholic clergy), the first synod of that clergy held since the reign of James II. Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, presided. Archbishop Daniel Murray (born in 1768 at Sheepwalk, near Arklow) had been ordained a priest in 1790 after studying in Spain (Salamanca). His first curacy was at Dublin, but he was transferred to Arklow, and was there when the rebellion of 1798 broke out. The soldiers shot his parish priest dead, and the young curate narrowly escaped a similar fate. He ministered, afterwards, as a curate, in Dublin until in 1809 he was appointed coadjutor-bishop to Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin: whom he succeeded in 1823. He was a vigorous opponent of the Veto, and an advocate of the Catholic Association's "unconditional Emancipation" policy. However, after Emancipation had been attained, he became friendly to the Government; he was even offered a seat on the Privy Council, but declined.

The synod of 1831 was opened with pomp and solemnity which must indeed have been strange joy to Irish Roman Catholics after so long a period of penal laws. There was a procession from the Hall of Theology to the chapel of the College: a cross-bearer leading the way, curates, parish priests, and the superiors of religious orders, following; then the canons of Dublin and Glendalough, in robes; then the vested Archbishop, attended by deacon and subdeacon. A profession of faith, in the words of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., was solemnly made in the chapel, and the

synod was opened with a celebration of pontifical High Mass.

The synod lasted four days, and it issued statutes drawn up with great care and embodied in twenty-seven chapters. A priest was forbidden to be possessor of more than fifteen acres of land; he must not attend balls, horse-races, or theatrical exhibitions; he must, when he appears in public, be attired in a becoming clerical dress. The chapels (until quite our own day, Roman Catholics in Ireland referred to their places of worship as "chapels," not as "churches"; it was a relic of the penal days) must be kept neat and clean, and not be used for public meetings of a non-religious kind. "A priest must not perform his ministrations in dirty or tattered vestments; neither must he celebrate Mass without a chalice or paten of gold or silver" (statutes, chapter xi.). The promotion of the cause of Temperance was a prominent aim of the synod. The clergy were enjoined to cultivate habits of sobriety, and to practise self-denial in the use of wine. Great gatherings at "wakes" were prohibited: (these watchings of the dead, prior to burial, were professedly acts of reverential sorrow, but all too often had degenerated to drunken orgies). "We altogether condemn and forbid," said the statutes, chapter xxvi., "that deplorable custom, so ruinous to Christian people, of supplying intoxicating liquor at funerals; and we command the clergy often to remind the people of this our prohibition. And, should it appear necessary, let the clergy threaten that they will not give their blessing at a burial if this practice, so much to be reprobated, be not abandoned." An entire chapter of the statutes dealt with "dues": the payments liable to be made to the clergy by the laity. No scale was fixed for the rich; but they were enjoined to contribute in proportion to their rank and ample fortune. The payments due from farmers and shopkeepers in good circumstances were carefully defined: at a baptism, five shillings; at a marriage, two pounds; as offering for a Mass for the dead, fifteen shillings; for a private Mass, two shillings. For people of humbler station, half these

rates were fixed. The clergy are counselled to leave their property, at their deaths, not to their relatives, but to the Church or to charity. When a priest is ill, the rural dean is to visit him and enquire whether he has made his will; of priest's wills the executor must be another priest of the same diocese. If a priest persists in refusing to make a will, his confessor must refuse him absolution.

The statutes carefully safeguarded the morals of the confessional. The priest must hear confessions only in a church, or in a sacristy, or in a private house where he is holding a "station" (see later). "The priest," said chapter xvi., "who shall endeavour to solicit or entice, to the commission of dishonourable or base sins either by words, or signs, or nods, or touch, or by writing—then, or afterwards to be read—any penitent, whosoever she be, either in the act of sacramental confession or in any other place destined or chosen to hear confessions, with the pretence of hearing confessions there, or who shall have held with presumptuous audacity any unlawful or dishonourable conversation or intercourse with them . . ., is suspended for ever." In short, every possible safeguard was placed round the sanctity of the confessional. (The "stations," referred to above, were a peculiarly Irish institution, a natural product of the legal difficulties in the way of practising a religion which nevertheless the majority of the population believed to be necessary to salvation. A parish priest and his curate would come, on some day which previously had been announced from the altar of the chapel, to a specially selected house in the town or village, and everyone within the district was expected to make that an occasion for going to confession.)

The statutes naturally were very minute as to the rules of administration of the sacraments. In celebrating Mass, a priest must adhere scrupulously to the Roman ritual. No priest may repeat prayers for anyone not under his spiritual jurisdiction. A priest must himself go to confession at least weekly. When a penitent confesses some enormous sin, the priest must take care not to show signs of indigna-

tion or astonishment, as that may hinder the penitent from making a full revelation of his crime. That he may be able to hear confessions properly, a priest must possess some book of moral theology, which he must read often. For purposes of mutual improvement, the priests must meet in conferences on theology four times annually: in the first or second week of July, August, September, and October. Should any priest be absent from two of these conferences in the same year, without written permission from the bishop or vicar-general, he incurs suspension.

"These statutes," said Dr. W. D. Killen (*Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, ii., 449; Dr. Killen was looking at the matter from an Irish Presbyterian point of view, and dissented from Roman Catholicism itself as, in his conception, "another Gospel" than that of Christ) yet: "These statutes present perhaps as favourable a view of Romanism as any enactments of the kind that ever were compiled. They were drawn up under the eye of an Irish prelate of consummate ability. . . . The regulations exhibit a laudable zeal for the reputatiom of the clergy. They provide for the exact performance of all official duties; and reveal the wonderful skill with which the whole ecclesiastical machinery is kept in motion."

The horrible shadow of famine fell on the land in 1845, when the potato-blight appeared in Wexford and spread gradually all over the country. "The stalks withered and died, the potatoes beneath the soil became putrid, and when they were dug and the sound ones separated from the unsound ones and put into pits, it was soon discovered that disease had entered the pits" (Dr. E. A. D'Alton, in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, viii., 108). The *Annual Register*, London, 1846, p. 132, said: "The apprehensions which had been for some time entertained, as to the state of the potato crop, were by this time [August, 1846] turned into an appalling certainty. The potato root was ascertained to be fearfully affected throughout England and Scotland, while in Ireland the destruction of the vegetable was reported to be universal and almost total. The apprehensions

of distress in England, and famine in Ireland, gave a tone to the writings of the public journals, and the speeches at public meetings; in short, the most gloomy misgivings as to the condition of the working classes during the coming winter universally prevailed." Further (pp. 147-148): "The total failure of the potato crop, and the utter deficiency of any other means of support, have produced [in Ireland], besides starvation, misery, and disease, the usual concomitants, violence and insubordination. The newspapers teem with reports of outrages in all parts of the south of Ireland. At Clashmore, near Youghal, a dangerous outbreak occurred. Lord Stuart de Decies and other magistrates had assembled at an extraordinary Assessment Sessions for the purpose of voting many thousand pounds to be expended in works for the relief of the distress, when the sessions house was surrounded by a mad mob, who demanded food, and attempted to dictate the rate of wages which should be paid. Lord Stuart and others of their proposed benefactors barely escaped without injury by the timely arrival of a troop of Hussars, who were attacked by the mob, and some of their horses injured; a few of the mob received sabre cuts. At Youghal the populace proceeded to such violence that a large detachment of marines, artillery, and seamen, were despatched to the protection of the town; but several mills, corn stores, farmers' houses, etc., were plundered. At Dungarvan a mob of from 10,000 to 12,000 people attacked and plundered the bakers' shops, mills, and stores; a troop of dragoons, which had been despatched for the protection of the town, were so severely attacked that they were compelled to fire, and many of the mob were wounded. At Kilworth, Castle Martyr, Fermoy, Croom, and many other places, similar outrages occurred; and the accounts of the distressed condition of the people throughout the country were dreadful."

That dreadful condition continued month after month, death and outrage on all sides. As to the outrages, one more quotation (*Annual Register*, 1847, pp. 160-161) must be enough: "The catalogue of murders during the past month

[November] is not less fearful than that of the preceding period, although no victims of high rank have fallen. On the 15th, two pensioners, Samuel Wilkinson and William Carson, were shot at Balinalee by an armed party, who fired at them as they were sitting by the fire. . . . Murphy, a farmer of Ballyvisteen, near Hospital, County Limerick, was shot dead in his own parlour, by a party of seven or eight men. . . . A farmer, named St. John, has been murdered near Lisnamrock, County Tipperary. . . . In the same county, a small farmer, named Brown, was shot within a few yards of his own house. He fell dead, struck with five slugs in the breast. The murder is ascribed to disappointed rivalry, Brown having some months ago married a wife with a little property, to the discomfiture of other suitors. . . . A magistrate of Monaghan, Mr. Johnston, of Ivy Hill, was shot at and wounded. Mr. McDonough, a farmer, residing at Shrew, County Galway, was fired at and severely wounded in the shoulder. In Tipperary, some villains fired a blunderbuss into the family of a man named Galvin, as they were sitting round the fire; Mrs. Galvin was dangerously wounded in the thigh by a bullet. Threatening notices were flying about in every direction; and, in consequence, the resident nobility and gentry were leaving the country with precipitation. The following paragraph from a letter will give some idea of the frightful state of the country: 'Every gentleman I have seen carries arms; some are constantly accompanied by police. At poor Mr. Lloyd's funeral, which was attended by all the gentry of the neighbourhood, all the gentlemen present were armed, and some carried their arms from their carriages into the churchyard.' The conduct of the landlords during this terrible time was selfish and cruel. With few exceptions they gave no employment and no subscriptions to the relief funds. Unable to get rents from tenants unable to pay, they used their right to evict, and in thousands of cases the horrors of eviction were added to the horrors of famine" (see also *Catholic Encyclopædia*, viii., 109).

The result of the famine, in regard to the figures of Irish population, was that, when the visitation ended in 1851, Ireland had six and a half million inhabitants, whereas, in the normal growth, it should have had nine millions. The importance of this potato-famine cannot be over-estimated. It had a calamitous economic effect in Ireland and also a far-reaching political effect, for it rendered impossible any permanent acquiescence, by the Roman Catholic Irish, in the Union; but it had also a very notable effect in England: thousands of Irish people emigrated, and those who came to England were, with their descendants, the life, soul, and nearly all the body, of the rebuilt English Roman Catholic Church.

In 1869 the Prime Minister, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, introduced his Bill to disestablish and disendow the Irish Established Church. Commissioners were appointed to manage the disendowment process, and, of the over £15,000,000 property of the disestablished Church, £11,000,000 were restored to it: part to existing office-holders, part for general Church-work. £1,000,000 were divided between Maynooth College (in place of the annual Government-grant, suppressed) and the Presbyterians (in place of the *Regium Donum* grant, suppressed). The surplus of the £15,000,000 was devoted to public purposes.

Under the penal laws, Roman Catholic education had been prevented in every possible legal way; yet, as we have seen, it survived to some extent by "hedge schools" and other crude methods, such as this: "What the Catholic primary schools were in the early years of the nineteenth century we learn from Carleton. The teacher, the product of a local hedge-school and a Munster classical school, or perhaps an ex-student of Maynooth, had first been employed as a tutor in some farmer's family. Then he became a hedge-schoolmaster, and the manner in which he attained to this position was peculiar. Challenging the schoolmaster, already in possession, to a public disputation, they met at the [Roman Catholic] church gates on Sunday in presence of the congregation. The intellectual swordplay between the

combatants was keenly relished, and, if the younger man won the applause of the audience by his depth of learning and readiness of reply, his opponent left the district and the victor was installed in his place. His school, built by the roadside by the peoples' voluntary efforts, was of earthen sods, with an earthen floor, a hole in the roof for a chimney, and stones for the pupils' seats. In many districts the teachers received little fees, but the people supplied him liberally with potatoes, meal, bacon, and turf, and entertained him at their houses" (D'Alton, in *Catholic Encyclopædia*, viii., 110).

Emphatically there is nothing to smile at in this! It was tragic: a people legally deprived of education; it was *heroic*: a people determined to have education.

In 1831 Lord Stanley, then Chief Secretary for Ireland, introduced into Parliament, and carried, a Bill setting up a National School Board. The schools thus opened allowed "right of entry" to ministers of all denominations. The system was never a good one in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church. "Since we cannot walk securely in religion one step except in union with and obedience to the Church, every well-instructed Catholic understands that the Church must preside over the education of Catholics at every stage and in every branch, so far as to see that they are sufficiently instructed in their religion" (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 295). With such an outlook the Roman Catholic Church could hardly be satisfied with the National Schools.

With regard to advanced education, the difficulty was that Trinity College, Dublin, the only old University in Ireland (it dates from Elizabeth's days) was practically Protestant, while the Queen's Colleges, set up by Sir Robert Peel, were also unsatisfactory to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, as making inadequate provision for religion. In 1908 Mr. Augustine Birrell, the Liberal Chief Secretary, passed an Irish University Act setting up two new Universities: the Queen's, at Belfast, and the National, at Dublin.

We cannot here go into the tragic history of the Home Rule and Sinn Féin struggles, except to chronicle the facts of the setting up, in 1921, of the Irish Free State, with the clause giving "Northern Ireland" option to contract out (an option which was automatically used). The present condition of Ireland seems to perpetuate the fundamental divisions set up by the Reformation: Southern Ireland taking for its ideal that of being "a Catholic nation" (this ideal was vigorously advocated at the Irish Catholic Truth Society Conference in the autumn of 1928), and Northern Ireland mainly Protestant.

It has well been said, however, that the Irish nation is not so much in Ireland as in other countries. Its emigrants to England have built up the Roman Catholic Church there; they are doing so in Scotland; they have flocked into the United States of America, Canada, Australia, South Africa: though, with regard to the last-named, we must make a qualification: "The [Roman] Catholics of South Africa are for the most part Irish or of Irish descent. They do not form a large proportion of the general population, for the tide of Irish emigration has set chiefly towards America and Australia. . . . Irishmen form about 90 per cent. of the Catholic population of the [Cape] Colony" (A. Hilliard Atteridge, in *Catholic Encyclopædia*, viii., 154).

The "dispersion of the Irish people" has been a chief factor in spreading Roman Catholicism throughout the English-speaking world.

In *Scotland* the Emancipation Act set in a strong tide of revivification of Roman Catholicism. An ecclesiastical seminary was opened at Blairs, near Aberdeen; in 1832 there was founded, at Edinburgh, the first convent of nuns since the Reformation. On March 4, 1878, Pope Leo XIII. did in regard to Scotland what his immediate predecessor had done in regard to England eighteen years previously: established a hierarchy of bishops with local territorial titles, but with this difference from the case of England—in the latter country new titles were adopted, but in Scotland those

of ancient sees were revived: the Archbishopric of St. Andrews and Edinburgh, with four suffragan Sees (Aberdeen, Argyll and the Isles, Dunkeld, and Galloway), and the Archbishopric of Glasgow, "immediately dependent on the Holy See," and having no suffragan sees.

The chief source of strength to Roman Catholicism in Scotland is immigration from Ireland: especially to Glasgow and Dundee. This movement is arousing considerable alarm among Scottish people.

In *England* few Roman Catholics, when the Emancipation Act placed them on a footing of legal freedom, at first could have hoped for more than a quiet, obscure life for their creed. We have heard Mr. Lilly's words as to the obscurity and humility of such small chapels as they possessed. They even referred—as we have also heard—to Mass as "prayers": thus avoiding offending Protestants! We have seen, further, that their ranks, small though they were, had been torn by dissension: laity against clergy—Cisalpine against Ultramontane. That last difficulty, however, was nearly at its end when Emancipation came. Bishop Milner had tried to end it by violent denunciation and bitter controversy, and, in so trying, made it worse. Bishop Poynter, on the other hand, tackled the trouble by methods of gentleness, and succeeded where those of violent polemics had failed. "Neither Dr. Milner nor Dr. Poynter lived to see Catholic Emancipation carried. The former died in 1826, the latter in 1827. (Dr. Milner left Dr. Poynter a legacy of £5, as a sign of good will). They left behind them the Cisalpine Club in a flourishing state as regards numbers, but with very little Cisalpinism in it; and the friction between laity and Vicars-Apostolic was practically at an end. We may look on the reunion of bishops and laity as the great work of Dr. Poynter's episcopate. When he was consecrated in 1803, the mutual distrust was almost at its worst; by the end of his life the whole was a matter of history. This result was achieved entirely by his personal influence, combined with a patience

and long-suffering which sometimes laid him open to the charge of weakness, but which in the long run secured its end. Loyalty to the bishops naturally brought with it loyalty to the Pope. The address of the Catholic laity to Pius VII. on his misfortunes was drawn up during a period of party strife; but it served a good purpose. The Holy Father replied six months later, and although the part of the reply bearing on controversial matters was not in the terms that several of the laymen had hoped, nevertheless the general effect was all in favour of a more desirable attitude on their part. After this time we do not hear of any repetition of the language about the Holy See, which was, unfortunately, so common in the days of the Committee" [the Cisalpine Club was the successor of the Catholic Committee] (Ward, *Catholic London a Century Ago*, pp. 38-39).

A few words must be said of the influence of the *émigrés*, driven from France by the Revolution. Douai College had been suppressed by the revolutionaries in 1793, as also had been the houses of English Benedictine monks in France (the English Benedictines never lost their continuity with the Order as it existed before the Reformation). The clergy dispersed in France sought shelter in other countries, and about 8,000 came to England. There can be no doubt this had some effect in lessening the dislike for Roman Catholicism. Now, however, was to come a movement whose results have been incalculable.

All things seemed conspiring to menace the Established Church. The Test and Corporation Acts had been repealed in 1828; freethought propaganda and revolutionary policies were all in the air; the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act had been passed; and, in 1832, the first Reform Bill had taken the House of Commons out of the hands of the aristocracy and placed it in those of the Middle Classes. The Established Church itself had long been dominated by a chilly Erastianism: Dr. Short, Bishop of St. Asaph, for example, could write (*History of the Church of England*, ed. 1838, p. 596) that the Church of England is "an author-

ised and paid Establishment, which is not allowed to persecute those who dissent from it." In these circumstances, the eyes of devout Churchmen sought for some purer, more lofty, ideal of the Church : and they turned to the Catholic past. This, of course, was nothing new. The Anglican Church is neither exclusively Protestant nor exclusively Catholic. Dating back to so many centuries before the Reformation, it had an ancient and august tradition. Its appeal was to the Catholic Church of ancient times. Its liturgy was framed on Catholic models, though reformed. Thus, the Anglican Church was neither Protestant and nothing else, nor Catholic and nothing else ; neither was it a mere "paid Establishment." Its ancient tradition and Catholic appeal raised it above a narrow Protestantism. Its reformed polity differentiated it from the Papal theory of Catholicity. It was Catholic and Reformed. Its Catholic appeal made it not only more than merely Protestant, but also prevented it from being a mere Erastian "paid Establishment." During the eighteenth century, however, the Erastian spirit had dominated it—a quite natural result of the 1688 Revolution : and the Oxford Movement, which began in 1833, was a reaction from Erastianism towards Catholicity.

Like all reactions, it was too violent. Its two chief leaders were John Keble and John Henry Newman. The *Tracts for the Times*, edited by Newman, created a remarkable sensation, though most of them seem tame enough to us in these days. The 90th Tract, however, written by Newman, proposed to show that the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England are reconcilable with the canons of the Council of Trent. The attempt, of course, was a sophistical one. The Council of Trent was the synod by which the Roman Catholic Church stereotyped mediævalism. The Thirty-nine Articles were the formulæ by which the English Church deliberately refused to be bound by mediævalism or by the Roman Church's claim to exclusive Catholicity. Attempts to reconcile the two could be but sophistry. All the bishops condemned Tract 90 : and no

wonder! To Newman, however, the blow was catastrophic. "I saw indeed clearly that my place in the Movement was lost; public confidence was at an end; my occupation was gone. It was simply an impossibility that I could say anything henceforth to good effect, when I had been posted up by the marshal on the buttery hatch of every college of my university, after the manner of discommoned pastry-cooks, and when in every part of the country and every class of society, through every organ and occasion of opinion, in newspapers, in periodicals, at meetings, in pulpits, at dinner-tables, in coffee-rooms, in railway carriages, I was denounced as a traitor who had laid his train and was detected in the very act of firing it against the time-honoured Establishment" (Newman, *Apologia*; *Everyman's Library* edition, p. 99).

Newman, of course, was no traitor. He simply had too narrow a theory of Catholicity. Catholicity must include progressive receptivity of new knowledge, as well as conservatism of what is ancient; but, to Newman's mind, Catholicity and liberal thought were antipathetic. After some years' painful deliberation—a painful deliberation which has left to us his beautiful and self-revealing *Apologia*—he joined the Roman Catholic Church, and was followed, in so doing, by a number of others. Still others, however—including Keble—remained in the English Church: and they were wiser, possessors of greater faith, and more philosophical. Newman, painful though his personal deliberation was, acted too hastily in relation to the magnitude of the problem.

However, the secessions gave a remarkable impetus to Roman Catholic propaganda. The converts, it is true, were not welcomed by the old members of the Church which they had joined. "Neither Newman's own conversion, nor that of a large number of his most distinguished disciples, sufficed to break down the wall of reserve and suspicion which had always separated the 'Old English' Catholics, such as Lingard and his school, from the leaders of the Oxford Movement. The sincerity of their Catholic

leanings had been doubted when they were Protestants; and the sincerity of their conversion was equally suspected now that they were Catholics" (Dom D. O. Hunter-Blair, in *Catholic Encyclopædia*, xv., 671-672). Wiseman, however, took a wiser view. Nicholas Patrick Wiseman, an Hispano-Irishman who was recognised as a deep Oriental scholar, was at that time coadjutor to Bishop Thomas Walsh, Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland District. He was a strenuous controversialist and eloquent lecturer. It was not likely he would fail to see the opportunities to be found in the public excitement, and spirit of enquiry, aroused by the Oxford Movement and the secessions.

In 1847 Wiseman was appointed Vicar-Apostolic of the London District, and, in July of the following year, occurred a very notable event in the history of modern English Roman Catholicism: the opening of the fine church of St. George in Southwark. The *Annual Register* for 1848, pp. 84-85, described the event thus: "The consecration of the Roman Catholic cathedral of St. George, erected in St. George's Fields, Lambeth, had been an event looked forward to with intense interest by all the English members of that communion. This church is the largest and most magnificent erected in England since the Reformation for the worship of the Church of Rome. Great numbers of the ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Continent were invited to the ceremonial; but the troubled state of the times prevented most of them from attending. There were present, however, the Archbishop of Trèves, the Bishops of Liège, Tournay, Chalons, and Chersonese, with their canons and chaplains. Of the British Roman Catholic prelates there were present, besides Dr. Wiseman, who officiated, Drs. Brown (Liverpool), Brown (Wales), Brown (Elphin), Sharples (Liverpool), Gellis (Edinburgh), Davis (Maitland, Australia), Waring (Eastern District), Briggs (York), Morris (Troy). There were 260 priests, together with members of the Orders of Passionists, Dominicans, Cistercians, Benedictines, Franciscans, Oratorians, and Brothers of Charity. The entire body of the church was filled with

Roman Catholic laity, among whom were the Earl of Shrewsbury, the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, M.P., Lord Camoys, Lord Stafford, Lord Lovat, etc. At eleven o'clock, the bishops were received at the western door, and the procession formed, consisting of the thurifer (the Hon. E. Petre); the incense-bearer (Sir T. Acton); acolytes (Hon. E. Stonor and Mr. Burke); the secular clergy in soutan and surplice, two and two; the regulars, in the dresses peculiar to the different Orders; and, lastly, the bishops in their mitres and robes. Youths bearing lights and lilies preceded and followed the procession. Dr. Wiseman celebrated High Mass, assisted by the Rev. Dr. Doyle, the pastor of the church. A Mass, partly by Hummel and partly by Drobisch, was chanted. The Offertory was sung by Tamburini."

It has seemed interesting and useful to quote this particular description, for the occasion must have been one of unique joy to the participants: even more notable than another unique event, then far future and undreamt of—the Eucharistic Congress of 1908, celebrated at Westminster in a yet finer cathedral than that of St. George's. I myself was one humble unit amongst the participants in that Congress, so I can enter fully into what must have been the feelings of the rejoicing hundreds in Southwark in 1848. Such events do not pass easily from the memory. I myself shall never forget the Congress of 1908; nor the friends with whom I walked afterwards, all rejoicing and zealous, from Westminster to Liverpool Street. Where are those friends now? Wherever they may be, peace to them! However, one must not allow personal digressions to become too long. Suffice it that, as the Congress of 1908 was never to be forgotten by those who joined in it, so the opening of St. George's, Southwark, must have been unforgettable to those who were *there*. It was, however, to be followed, within two years, by an event which would rouse all England.

It will be remembered that, even before the passing of the Emancipation Act, there had been desires for the setting up in England of a regular system of Roman Catholic bishops.

The Cisalpines wished for it under the strange impression that it would make English Roman Catholics freer from Roman influence! However, in 1850 (September 29), the Pope issued an Apostolic Brief setting up, in England, an Archbishopric of Westminster with twelve suffragan Sees : Southwark, Plymouth, Clifton, Newport and Menevia, Shrewsbury, Liverpool, Salford, Hexham and Newcastle, Beverley, Nottingham, Birmingham, Northampton. On the following day Wiseman was named first Archbishop of Westminster and raised to the Cardinalate with the title of St. Pudentiana.

The excitement aroused all over England by these acts was prodigious. We smile at it now : but it was by no means without some basis in reason. The Pope's Brief totally ignored the very existence of the Church of England, and professed to set up a hierarchy of Christian bishops in a land which was assumed to have none : " Wherefore, after having duly considered the whole matter, of our own motion and certain knowledge, and of the plenitude of our Apostolic authority, we decree and ordain that in the Kingdom of England shall again flourish, according to the common laws of the Church, the hierarchy of bishops in ordinary, who shall take their titles from their Sees."

The popular excitement over this, of course, was largely due to being associated with that over the Oxford Movement; but the Papal Brief was regarded also as an attack on the ecclesiastical rights of the Crown. So it was !—but a quite harmless one. Theoretically, it denied the very existence of the Established Church, as a Church ; but then, Roman Catholics make that denial by the very fact of being Roman Catholics. Dr. Wiseman as a Vicar-Apostolic was just as much a challenge to the Church of England as was Dr. Wiseman as Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster. However, the popular clamour had to be placated ; so the Premier, Lord John Russell, passed his Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, forbidding the use of titles such as those just bestowed by the Pope. It was a dead-letter from the beginning, and the Roman Catholic hierarchy, established by Pius IX., has

continued to be the framework round which the Latin Church in this country has developed. On October 28, 1911, Pope Pius X. divided the previous single province of Westminster into three: the Archbishoprics of Westminster, Liverpool, and Birmingham. On February 17, 1916, Benedict XV. set up the Archbishopric of Cardiff, thus giving Wales, in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church, the status of an ecclesiastical province. On July 20, 1917, the same Pope formed the diocese of Brentwood, comprising the county of Essex.

Even after the setting up of the hierarchy by Pope Pius IX., the English Roman Catholic clergy were regarded, in Roman canon-law, as "missionary": that is, as not having the ordinary status of parish priests, and as coming under the oversight of the Congregation of Propaganda at Rome. This was to continue until, by the Constitution *Sapienti Consilio* of Pius X. in 1908, the full rules of regular canon law were applied to England.

How have things developed in the working? Of course, Roman Catholicism experiences an ebb and flow of members: loss by "leakage," gain by conversions. With regard to the conversions, the gross annual totals, as given in *The Catholic Directory*, seem large: round about 11,000 yearly; but they require analysis. Of the genuineness of the figures there can, of course, be no doubt. Every convert to Roman Catholicism has to be formally received, after instruction, and the reception notified to the local bishop on a form specially kept for that purpose. The figures, then, cannot be questioned: but how far do they go? They show how many English-residing people join the Roman Catholic Church every year—but they do not show how many of these remain therein for life. That, however, is what matters. The annual figures, as published, vary yearly very little: the gross total is always the same within a few score, and the detailed totals (of individual dioceses) are the same within a few units. Is this natural for such deep, anxious spiritual crises as would normally precede life-long submission to an infallible Church? One would not

expect such mathematical regularity in such a matter. On the other hand, such regularity would not be natural if large numbers of conversions are due to deep causes; but, in that case, they are unlikely to be permanent: or even, in some cases, to last very long. That many converts to Roman Catholicism are sincere, devoted, and unlikely to "lapse," cannot be denied. That others are deep and sincere, and, if they "lapse," will do so only after many years and for adequate logical motives, is also sure. But what of the rest?—what proportion of those strangely similar totals is composed of mere temporary adherents who, while genuine in their desire for reception at the time reception occurs, are quite superficial and as easily drop off? There are no means of ascertaining the answer to this: but it is an interesting and very important question.

There is also the "leakage." It affects every religious denomination, but it is far more serious in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church than in that of any other, because that Church believes herself to be the One Ark of Salvation, outside which (save for special reasons known only to God's "uncovenanted mercy") there is no hope for human souls. Thus, to leave her is to risk eternal loss: so she must look with graver eyes than does any other religious body on "leakage." Yet admittedly it is large. On the whole, it is open to doubt whether the Roman Catholic Church in England has made appreciable numerical progress, in proportion to the general population, in the last eighty years. In the 'forties and 'fifties of the nineteenth century she had a very considerable accretion: due to immigration from Ireland consequent on the horrible potato-famines. The pence of those humble but devoted Irish built many a church. But for them, the successors of Wiseman would have had but little upon which to build. There seem, however, to have been few signs of any other great numerical accretions since those days.

Even, however, if numerical growth, in proportion to the general population, is small if any, yet the same cannot be said of the growth of the Roman Catholic

Church here in organisation, influence, and ecclesiastical possessions.

Wiseman was succeeded, on his death in 1865, by Henry Edward Manning. It may here be remarked that Wiseman had not been the originally designated first Archbishop of Westminster. Dr. Walsh, Vicar-Apostolic of the London District (to whom Wiseman was coadjutor), had been designed for the position. The revolution of 1848 in Rome, however, delayed the issue of the Brief establishing the hierarchy, and Bishop Walsh died on February 18, 1849. Wiseman became his successor as Vicar-Apostolic, and thus became first Archbishop of Westminster. Neither was Manning the first-designated aspirant to be second Archbishop. That post was intended for Dr. Errington, Cardinal Wiseman's coadjutor : and the process by which he was superseded forms a painful chapter in ecclesiastical intrigue. However, Manning became second Archbishop, and his *régime* was undoubtedly one of progress. He turned his attention especially to the provision of education for the Roman Catholic poor. He established the Westminster Diocesan Education Fund in 1866. The success of this was remarkable : and, ever since then, an elementary school has been regarded as a necessity for the proper constitution of a Roman Catholic parish. Manning aimed also at providing a Roman Catholic university, and a college was opened at Kensington. It was a failure, and, soon after, the ecclesiastical ban was raised which had forbidden Roman Catholics to go to the ordinary national universities. The policy in our own day is to utilise those universities as much as possible.

Herbert Vaughan, a member of the old Roman Catholic (and, for long, Jacobite) family of the Vaughans, of Courtfield, Ross, Herefordshire, succeeded Manning in 1892. He had been Bishop of Salford, and, in that capacity, had devoted special attention to the education of the poor and the saving them from being lost to the Church. He ordered a house-to-house census to be made by the clergy. The result was to reveal an appalling degree of " leakage." As

a result, Bishop Vaughan started the Rescue and Protection Society. When he became Archbishop of Westminster, it was he who secured the reversal of the ban on Roman Catholics going to the national universities. A good deal of his time was taken up with the controversy as to the validity of the orders of the clergy in the Church of England, and it is acknowledged to be due to his intervention that Pope Leo XIII. was prevented from making a friendly approach to the Anglican Archbishops. On September 13, 1896, the Pope issued the Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ*, declaring, "on our own motion and certain knowledge," that "ordinations conferred according to the Anglican rite have been, and are, absolutely null and utterly void." It had been expected that the Bull would result in numerous conversions from the Church of England; but that was not so. In fact, the arguments of the Bull seem strangely weak, depending in the main on a doctrine of "intention" which would cast doubt on all sacraments, and on an assumption that the validity of orders is to be judged by standards based on mediæval theories of the Mass. However, the Bull was issued, and, ever since then, the attitude of Roman Catholic polemics to the Church of England has been exceedingly bitter.

One of Cardinal Vaughan's ambitions was to build a great cathedral for his diocese. Manning had secured a site, but it was mortgaged. Vaughan not only paid off the mortgage, but, by June of 1895, had laid the foundation-stone of the cathedral and placed a balance of £75,000 in the bank. He lived to see the cathedral sufficiently built to be opened for public worship. When he died (June 19, 1903, at St. Joseph's Missionary College, Mill Hill: he had always been an ardent advocate of mission-work), a spiked iron circlet, with the spikes on the inner side, was found on his left arm.

His successor was Francis Bourne, then Roman Catholic Bishop of Southwark. It would be invidious to estimate—or to be so rash as to try so to do—the episcopate of a prelate who is still with us; but it may be acknowledged,

even by those of us who have no admiration for the inflexibilities of Ultramontane ecclesiastical politics, that, during that episcopate, Roman Catholicism in England has gained influence it never had before. It may also be mentioned that a speech delivered by Cardinal Bourne in 1911—a speech in which he distinguished carefully between the Pope's spiritual independence and his territorial claims—probably contributed appreciably towards preparing the way for the arrangement which (permanently or otherwise, one can but speculate) has been arrived at between the Papacy and the Italian State over the question of the Temporal Power.

Under the three English and one Welsh Archbishops, and their suffragans, then, the Roman Catholic Church in this country has perfected the episcopal organisation founded by Pope Pius IX. in 1850: the organisation of which Cardinal Newman said (preaching before the First Provincial Synod of the Westminster Archdiocese, July 13, 1852; see *Sermons preached on Various Occasions*, 1881, p. 169): "Babylon was great, and Tyre, and Egypt, and Nineveh, and shall never be great again. The English Church was, and the English Church was not, and the English Church is once again. This is the portent, worthy of a cry. It is the coming in of a Second Spring; it is a restoration in the moral world, such as that which yearly takes place in the physical." (Newman, of course, assumed that the Roman Catholics are the continuation of the ancient English Church, and that the Anglican Church is nothing. That assumption is due to a defective notion of Catholicity, but let it pass.)

The Roman Catholic Church in this country is essentially, and even passionately, propagandist. Its aim is to convert England. Indeed, ever since Cardinal Wiseman's days special prayers have been said, in every English Roman Catholic church, for that intention. On May 2, 1867, the Roman Catholic bishops of England, by a special resolution, ordered that, on the second Sunday of every month, there is to be Exposition and Benediction of the

Blessed Sacrament for the conversion of England; and they recommended, as suitable for use on those occasions, a special litany and prayers composed by Cardinal Wiseman, of which some words may here be quoted (they are in, for example, modern editions of Challoner's *Garden of the Soul*):

"O merciful God, let the glorious intercession of thy Saints assist us; particularly the most blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of thy only-begotten Son, and thy holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, to whose patronage we humbly recommend this country. Be mindful of our fathers, Eleutherius, Celestine, and Gregory, bishops of the Holy City; of Augustine, Columba, and Aidan, who delivered to us inviolate the faith of the Holy Roman Church. Remember our holy martyrs, who shed their blood for Christ; especially our first martyr, St. Alban, and thy most holy bishop, St. Thomas of Canterbury. Remember all those holy confessors, bishops, and kings, all those holy monks and hermits, all those holy virgins and widows, who made this once an island of saints, illustrious by their glorious merits and virtues. Let not their memory perish from before thee, O Lord, but let their supplication enter daily into thy sight; and do thou, who didst so often spare thy sinful people for the sake of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, now, also, moved by the prayers of our fathers, reigning with thee, have mercy upon us, save thy people, and bless thine inheritance. . . ." From the *Litany of Intercession for England*: "Lord, have mercy on us; Christ, have mercy on us; Lord, have mercy on us; . . . Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for England; . . . St. Michael, prince of the Church, . . . All ye holy angels and blessed spirits of heaven, . . . St. Peter, prince of the Apostles and supreme pastor of Christ's sheep, . . . All ye holy saints of all places, . . . pray for England; From the spirit of pride, rebellion, and apostasy, . . . From schism, heresy, and all blindness of heart, . . . deliver England, O Lord. . . . Deliver the ignorant from being misled by false teachers, the learned from being seduced by their passions, and the whole nation from the spirit of contradiction, licentiousness, and discord: that they may be

restored to that unity of mind, steadiness of faith, and peace of conscience, which are nowhere to be sought but in the communion of thy Church. . . ."

When it is realised that this spirit has been animating Roman Catholicism in England ever since Wiseman's days, and urges on zealous propagandists constantly, it will be seen it is to be taken seriously. Zeal and devotion go a long way. In the next and final chapter we shall consider basic principles, however; so this chapter may end with a review of the main organisations by which, under the hierarchy of bishops, the Roman Catholic Church works in England.

In the 'seventies it occurred to some zealous Roman Catholic propagandists that the example of Newman's *Tracts for the Times* might be adapted to the definite service of the Roman Church. The idea languished for a time; but, on November 5, 1884, at the house of Lady Herbert of Lea, a meeting was held—Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Vaughan presiding—at which the Catholic Truth Society was inaugurated for spreading cheap but well-written booklets in defence of Roman Catholicism. The inspiring spirits were the Rev. Father Cologan and Mr. James Britten: a convert from the Anglican Church and a scholar of exceptional exactness. During the later years of his long life I was privileged to number him amongst my friends, and shall always regard his memory with affection. In his controversial writings, it is true, he rather overdid the "sarcasm" element: but he was unrivalled in tracking down errors of fact. The Catholic Truth Society devoted its energies chiefly to the publication of penny tracts on historical, doctrinal, and devotional subjects: and these supplied an armoury for freelance controversialists. After the 1914-1918 War, the Society was reorganised on a wider basis. One of the means of propaganda which it had popularised was the setting up of little bookstands in the porches of Roman Catholic Churches.

Another popular organisation founded by a convert from the Church of England is the "Guild of Our Lady

of Ransom for the Conversion of England." It was founded by the Rev. Philip Fletcher, fifth son of Sir H. Fletcher, Bart. Father Fletcher had been a Church of England curate (St. Bartholomew's, Brighton), but joined the Roman communion in 1878. Nine years later he, in co-operation with Mr. Lister Drummond (also a convert from the Church of England), founded the Ransom Guild. Its name was derived from a mediæval Crusading custom of ransoming captives from the Muslims. A main feature of the Guild's work was organising outdoor processions. When first begun, these Roman Catholic functions were a startling novelty to English people, and it needed considerable courage to engage in them. In a volume published after his death (he died on January 13, 1928, aged 79), and which is entitled *Recollections of a Ransomer*, Father Fletcher gave interesting accounts of those pageants. They serve a double purpose—that of devotion on the part of the participants, and of bringing Roman Catholic pageantry to the eyes of the general public. One special annual function of the Guild's is the "Martyrs' Walk": a march from Newgate to Tyburn (Marble Arch, Hyde Park), in honour of the Roman Catholics executed during and after the reign of Henry VIII. Father Fletcher's dying message to his Guild was: "Oh, continue! . . . God bless you all. You may not do much, but you may—continue!" (An organisation associated with the Guild of Ransom is the Converts' Aid Society, for giving financial or other assistance to ministers of other Churches who become Roman converts.)

The Catholic Reading Guild is a comparatively small body which takes as its motto "the conversion of England by books." It was founded about twenty-seven years ago, but nearly collapsed during the Great War period. It was reorganised, however, by a lay convert, a very clever public speaker, Mr. George E. J. Coldwell. Its work is mainly that of a library; but also it undertakes to answer "enquiries concerning the Catholic faith." Whilst I was on its executive I formed a very favourable opinion of it: but of course it is

subject—as are all Roman Catholics—to the rules of the canon law as embodied in the "Index of Prohibited Books."

The Catholic Missionary Society is a community of secular priests who devote their energies to giving lectures to "non-Catholics." Its president is the Rev. Herbert Vaughan, a nephew of the late Cardinal. It publishes a monthly magazine, *The Catholic Gazette*.

Efforts to convert Jews to Roman Catholicism are made by the Catholic Guild of Israel, with English headquarters at the Convent of Our Lady of Sion at Bayswater, London: but it is intimately connected with a kindred French organisation. (NOTE: In April, 1928, Pope Pius XI., by a decree of the Holy Office, suppressed a body called "The Friends of Israel": see *The Universe* newspaper, April 20, 1928. That body had no connection with the Catholic Guild of Israel.)

The Catholic Evidence Guild was founded in 1918 to give lectures, expository of Roman doctrine, in parks and other open spaces. Its speakers are mostly young laymen and women: though priests also sometimes speak on its platforms. The lay speakers have to possess a licence from the bishop of their diocese. These licences may be "general"—*i.e.*, their holders may deal with any relevant topic—or may be confined to one subject only.

The Catholic Confederation of England and Wales was chiefly—I do not say exclusively, for no doubt it does some independent work—the inclusive name for the Salford and Westminster diocesan Catholic Federations. The Salford Federation was the organ (until, in 1929, it had to be dissolved) of Lancashire Roman Catholics. Previously to the formation of the first British Labour Government, the Salford Federation persistently attacked the Labour Party on the ground that it is Socialistic, and that Socialism is condemned by Papal encyclicals. In the latter proposition the Federation was correct; but it cannot be forgotten that there is no British political party which does not advocate some principle condemned in some Papal encyclical: so that, if such encyclicals are to guide the political activities

of British Roman Catholics, it is hard to see how the latter have any place at all in our public life. As to the Westminster Federation, it is organised on a basis of branches democratically electing their officers: though the Archbishop for the time being of Westminster can nominate to some offices on the central executive. When I was an active worker on this Federation, I found that most of the important work was done in small committees at headquarters. Of those committees one of the principal is that of "Vigilance," which keeps a general outlook in defence of the faith, and pays special attention to the press. The Federation was started in 1905 to defend the Roman Catholic schools against legislative proposals of the then Liberal Government, and it has continued to be specially preoccupied with that subject of education.

A body of recent formation is the Catholic Council for International Relations. It was founded in 1923, and has become affiliated to similar bodies in several other countries. Its founder was Mr. John Eppstein, an enthusiastic supporter of the League of Nations, and, in an introduction to a booklet (*Catholics and the Problem of Peace*, 1925, p. 8) descriptive of its objects, he said: "The Council then has two objects, logically distinct but actually complementary. The first is to promote unity of action between Catholics of all nations in matters relating to their religion; secondly, to promote international peace." The difficulty of this is, however, that ecclesiastical action in politics by no means always or necessarily promotes peace. It did not do so when, in 1648, Pope Innocent X., by his Bull *Zelo domus Dei*, condemned the Peace of Westphalia. It did not do so when, in 1570, by his Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, Pope Pius V. deposed Elizabeth of England. No doubt the conditions of the world are very different now; still—so long as a Church claims to be "a perfect society," superior to the civil power, and with rights of "coercion": and these claims are still made by the Roman Church—so long is ecclesiastical political action as logically liable to lead to conflict as to peace. The line of wisdom is for Churches to be non-

political: not merely as avoiding particular parties, but as avoiding political activities as such.

The Catholic Social Guild was formed to study economic problems in the light of the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII. It tends to favour the betterment of working-class conditions on the lines of that Pontiff's encyclical (*Rerum Novarum*) on "the state of the labourers." Leo declared that working-people must have wages "sufficient to support them as frugal and well-behaved," and he denounced such capitalists as treat them "worse than slaves." However, he upheld the distinctions of wealthy and poor: the latter should show "meek resignation"; moreover, he held forth the doctrine that working-class organisations should be under the direction of bishops, at least indirectly: and, in other encyclicals (for example, *Libertas Præstantissimum Donum*), he denounced many cherished "modern liberties," and declared that States must obey the priesthood. Even with its very moderate programme, however, the Catholic Social Guild was regarded with dislike by some Conservative-minded English Roman Catholics, as "Socialistic"!—but, to the extent of its ability, it tended in a liberal-minded direction. In co-operation with it, a Catholic Workers' College was set up in association with Oxford University: to train selected students in economics from a Roman Catholic point of view. "The Guild has provided the initiative and publicity which set the College on its feet. . . . The Guild's Executive Committee is the governing body of the College. . . . The two—Guild and College—are intimately bound together in aims and organisation" (Rev. L. O'Hea, S.J., in *The Universe* newspaper, March 16, 1928). The clerical influence behind the movement is evidently chiefly, if not solely, that of the Society of Jesus; and the ideal seems to be that economics should be interpreted from an ecclesiastical point of view.

The Society for the Maintenance of the Apostolic See was formed in 1925, to collect funds for the Vatican. At the 1928 annual meeting, held in the Westminster Cathedral Hall, Viscount FitzAlan said: "I feel rather in the position

of a judge who, in reply to a woman who stated she intended to trust in God, said: 'You must do something more practical than that.' So besides praying we can all contribute; and as with the supplications, so with the funds—there is no limitation of subscription, except the minimum of one shilling yearly for adults and sixpence for children. . . . I admit having at first anticipated a clashing between the Society's affairs and Peter's Pence, but I am glad to find myself mistaken, and to know that neither the Cardinal nor his predecessors had ever been able to lay a larger sum at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff than was the case last year" (see *The Tablet* newspaper, March 3, 1928). It will be seen that the object of the Society is to collect more British money for the Holy See than is obtained by previously existing agencies; and, indeed, not only *British* money, for Lord FitzAlan "urged the extension of the Society not only to every diocese in England, but throughout the world."

Two relatively small organisations are the Catholic Union and the Catholic Association. The former is in some respects similar to the Catholic Federation: it undertakes to watch over and defend Roman Catholic interests generally, but it is essentially or by custom an aristocratic body. The Catholic Association is chiefly confined to social functions and the arranging of pilgrimages. Then there is the Catenian Association (*catena*, a chain): perhaps not inaptly describable as a sort of "Roman Catholic Freemasons." It is composed of professional and business men for mutual aid. One of its rules is that clergy cannot attend its private meetings or be members; but it has public meetings which the clergy may attend on the same footing as other guests. The "Knights of St. Columba" (Columba, the Scottish saint) is a body somewhat like the Catenians, but of more recent formation and of wider scope of membership: it admits members of all classes and does not exclude the clergy. Its name is an adaptation of that of the powerful United States organisation, the Knights of Columbus. It has a monthly magazine, *Columba*.

Besides these organisations, there are the definitely

devotional ones attached to the parishes. The chief is the Guild of the Blessed Sacrament. Then there is the "Children of Mary" for unmarried women. The Jesuit churches have the Men's Sodality, *Prima Primaria*, linked up with headquarters at Rome. Of smaller devotional organisations are the "Bona Mors" society (for praying that one may escape an unhappy death), the Knights of the Blessed Sacrament (a kind of sentimental "bond of chivalry," started before the Great War by the Rev. Edmund Lester, S.J.), and the St. Vincent de Paul Society (which organises charity among poorer members of the Church). There are also the Catholic Prisoners' Aid Society, for assisting Roman Catholics who may have had to go to prison; and the Crusade of Rescue, for the reception of destitute children (it was established after a dispute with Dr. Barnardo's Homes, so as to avoid Roman Catholic destitute children being brought up as Protestants).

The various religious Orders and communities of men and women nearly all have houses in England: the Augustinians, the Benedictines, the Canons Regular of the Lateran, the Carmelites, the Carthusians, the Reformed Cistercians, the Dominicans, the various types of Franciscans, the Rosminians, the Jesuits, the Oblates of St. Mary Immaculate, the Passionists, the Premonstratensians, the Redemptorists, the Salesians, and the Servites. The Benedictines have several handsome abbeys, as Downside and Buckfast. The Dominicans and Redemptorists engage largely in propaganda amongst those outside the Roman Catholic Church; the others, in educational, parochial, preaching, propaganda, and other various works; and there are the purely *contemplative* Orders, as the Carmelites. With regard to the Jesuits, the characteristic of that order has been always "variety." It has several colleges for the education of boys of the upper and middle classes: as, Stonyhurst, Beaumont, Holywell, Liverpool, London (Stamford Hill and Wimbledon). It engages actively in literary polemics. Its church at Farm Street, Mayfair, London, is a noted centre for that and for controversial sermons.

Finally, there is the "Catholic press." This is a very efficient engine of propaganda, and may be divided into four categories: 1. The weeklies; 2. The monthlies, and the quarterly *Dublin Review*; 3. The lesser monthly magazines; 4. The books.

The weeklies are: *The Tablet*, *The Universe*, *The Catholic Times*, and *The Catholic Herald* (with its Scottish edition, *The Glasgow Observer*): these are newspapers, and there are the "family budgets," *The Catholic Fireside* and *Home Topics* (formerly *The Catholic Home Journal*)—which are associated with *The Catholic Times* and *The Catholic Herald* respectively.

The Tablet, although often supposed to be an "official" paper, is not so really. It is owned by, with others, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster and Bishop of Nottingham, so its link with officialdom is close. This is not the place to criticise it. It is a clever paper: but often a little on the over-truculent side in controversy. *The Universe* has risen, since the War, to a position immensely higher in influence than it occupied of old. At one time, indeed, it was a small publication printed largely in Irish Gaelic. Since 1917, it has come into the front rank of religious journalism: and, if complaints might be made as to some unfairness in its methods at times, this is not the place to go into that. *The Catholic Times* was formerly the leading Roman Catholic weekly, but it now has to reckon with *The Universe*. However, it retains a large influence. In my opinion, it is the best of the Roman Catholic weeklies for one special reason: it is the fairest to opponents. *The Catholic Herald* (and *Glasgow Observer*) is issued on a "localised" system: editions adapted to provincial centres as well as to London. It is excellent as a newspaper—but it would be better if it had a tone of controversy less excessively bitter. However, it must be remembered that the "Catholic press" is written not for Protestants but for Roman Catholics: and no doubt it keeps them in a high state of zeal against "the wicked world."

The "monthlies" are *The Month* (the literary and controversial organ of the Jesuits), *The Catholic Gazette* (organ

of the Catholic Missionary Society), *Columba* (the Knights of St. Columba's magazine), *Chimes* (magazine of the Benedictines of Buckfast), *Blackfriars* (formerly *The Catholic Review*): the Dominican organ. The "lesser monthlies" (this term refers to size and specialised appeal; not necessarily to quality!) are *The Ransomer* (the Guild of Ransom's monthly); *Catholic Book Notes* (a small literary review issued bound up with the monthly chronicle of the Catholic Truth Society); three Jesuit devotional, controversial, and propagandist monthlies—*The Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, *Stella Maris* ("Star of the Sea" is a litany-title of the Blessed Virgin), and *Introibo* (for encouraging vocations to the priesthood—*introibo* at the beginning of the Mass). *The Christian Democrat* is the little monthly of the Catholic Social Guild.

It will be seen that Roman Catholicism in England is well served with denominational literature. The periodicals all promote a high, zealous Ultramontane tone. Then there are *the books*: there are several Roman Catholic publishing houses with book-issuing programmes covering books of all types, from massive scholastic tomes to tiny devotional manuals or story-books; and there are the Catholic Truth Society's books. (Scotland and Ireland both have Catholic Truth Societies of their own.)

Finally, Roman Catholics do not confine themselves to their own press in their propaganda. The further idea is to make fullest possible use of the many opportunities which occur for propaganda of Roman Catholicism through the hospitable columns of the general press: and even in the press of other religious denominations—which, not being bound by any canon law as to *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, frequently afford to Roman Catholics opportunities which are taken. It is a settled policy to advertise Roman Catholic books in non-Roman Catholic periodicals—but advertisements of books critical of Roman Catholicism would be unlikely to be accepted for insertion in Roman Catholic papers.

CHAPTER X

BASIC PRINCIPLES

We have surveyed, in however fragmentary a way, yet fairly and without partisan bias, a long series of desperate struggles in the name of religion. What is the meaning of it? That men, in the name of the divine, the holy, the supreme good, should persecute and slay one another; should erect barriers against one another; should penalise one another's interpretation of those divine and holy things: this is a strange paradox. Yet it is no more strange than another paradox—namely, that men of differing beliefs, about the ultimate mysteries of the universe, have been bitterly intolerant, each convinced of the infallibility of his own creed, although the very differences of belief show that the matter is uncertain. We remember the pathetic complaint of Descartes (see *Discourse on Method*, trans. J. Veitch, pp. 5 and 8): "From my childhood I have been familiar with letters; and as I was given to believe that by their help a clear and certain knowledge of all that is useful in life might be acquired, I was ardently desirous of instruction. But as soon as I had finished the entire course of study, at the close of which it is customary to be admitted into the order of the learned, I completely changed my opinion. For I found myself involved in so many doubts and errors, that I was convinced I had advanced no farther in all my attempts at learning than the discovery at every turn of my own ignorance. . . . Of philosophy I will say nothing, except that when I saw that it had been cultivated for many ages by the most distinguished men, and that yet there is not a single matter within its sphere which is not still in dispute, and nothing, therefore, which is above doubt, I did not presume to anticipate that my

success would be greater than that of any others; and further, when I considered the number of conflicting opinions, touching a single matter, that may be upheld by learned men, while there can be but one true, I reckoned as well-nigh false all that was only probable."

"What theory of the universe," asked Sir Leslie Stephen (*An Agnostic's Apology*, chapter i.), "am I to accept as demonstrably established? At the very earliest dawn of philosophy men were divided by earlier forms of the same problems which divide them now. Shall I be a Platonist or an Aristotelian? Shall I admit or deny the existence of innate ideas? . . . Shall I believe in Hobbes or in Descartes? Can I stop where Descartes stopped, or must I go on to Spinoza? Or shall I follow Locke's guidance, and end with Hume's scepticism? Or listen to Kant: and, if so, shall I decide he is right in destoyring theology, or in reconstructing it, or in both performances? . . ."

This uncertainty of human beliefs—whether in philosophy or in religion—has at any rate one inevitable logical result. It teaches us that it is a duty to be tolerant: and that, if any religious or other school of belief denies the duty of tolerance, it is wrong in such denial.

The Roman Catholic Church itself, the most dogmatic of all Churches, although it believes in exclusiveness and in intolerance as a principle, yet holds other principles which ought to lead to the recognition that tolerance is right. "The existence," says the Rev. J. McHugh, O.P. (*Catholic Encyclopædia*, x., 662), "of theological mysteries is a doctrine of the Catholic faith defined by the Vatican Council, which declares: 'If anyone say that in Divine Revelation there are contained no mysteries properly so-called (*vera et proprie dicta mysteria*) . . . let him be anathema'"; and: "The mind of a creature cannot, indeed, grasp the inner nature of the mysterious truth, but it can express that truth by analogies."

What is that but the doctrine of "the relativity of knowledge"? No doubt the theologians will answer that all that is meant is that the ecclesiastical dogmas do not exhaust

the subjects with which they deal—but that, nevertheless, they are true so far as they go. Is that much of an answer, however? If the Church's dogmas are surrounded by mystery beyond comprehension, how are we to be sure that that mystery does not contain elements which, if known, would make the dogmas seem very different from what is commonly understood? In any case, an attitude of exclusivism and intolerance *must be* wrong!

Religion has been always a vital factor in human life. As Herbert Spencer said (*First Principles*, part i., chapter i., § 6): "An unbiassed consideration forces us to conclude that Religion, everywhere present as a weft running through the warp of human history, expresses some eternal fact." It is, however, also obvious that no system of dogmatic theology has been, or is, able to represent that fact adequately. Such systems, however august and valuable, are all partial and largely defective. Therefore, tolerance is a duty, and any organisation, opposed to tolerance, is, at least in that respect, mistaken. Relgion is man's spiritual striving after the Ultimate Divine Reality; so far as he is exclusive and intolerant, thus far he restricts the success of his own efforts.

The great Roman Church, for example, has stood, and stands, for the reality of religion. It has spoiled, however, much of its own usefulness by its spirit of exclusivism and intolerance. That spirit is a sign, not of catholicity, but of partial development. We can quite see how that exclusivism, and that intolerance, arose. Partly they came of the theological tendency—by no means confined to that Church—to be impatient of the rights of other minds. Partly, also, it came of the Roman Church's secular power in the Middle Ages.

The Papal claims to dominate States were natural in the Middle Ages. The Papacy to a considerable extent inherited the powers and ideals of the Imperial Cæsars. The mediæval kings and other warriors were often largely barbarian, and Europe was chaotic. What more natural than that the Papacy, as the most august power then existing,

should dominate those lesser powers?—and, as it was a religious as well as a political power, what more natural than that it should claim supernatural warrant for even its political powers? To a great extent, these claims, even though erroneous, must have been useful in so confused times. Of course, they were associated also with much evil. Religion became deeply tainted with worldly corruption. It became cruel: the Inquisitions arose, and what can be described almost as "human sacrifices" were offered up at the burning stakes. Whole districts were devastated in massacres: as in the Albigensian Crusade. These heartrending evils demonstrate one thing: that the claim of a Church to dominate society as a whole is and was—however inevitable at one time—an essentially mistaken claim. With the growth of knowledge it would have to give way.

Even in our own age, however, the Roman Church retains that ideal. When a Pope is crowned, the Cardinal-deacon places upon his head the triple-crown, saying, "Receive the Tiara, and know that thou art Father of princes and kings, Ruler of the world, and Vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ." "Father of princes and kings, and Ruler of the world." Even in our own day a Roman Catholic newspaper—in England, too—can say: "Popes may crown kings, but not kings Popes" (*The Tablet* February 23, 1929, p. 248). And the essential claims made, in 1302, by Boniface VIII. in his Bull *Unam Sanctam*, have been expressed, in less crude words but with similar meaning, by Pope Leo XIII:

"The Founder of the Church willed her sacred power to be distinct from the civil power, and each power to be free and unshackled in its own sphere: with this condition, however—a condition good for both, and of advantage to all men—that union and concord should be maintained between them; and that on those questions which are, though in different ways, of common right and authority, the power to which secular matters have been entrusted should happily and becomingly depend on the other power

[the Roman Catholic Church] which has in its charge the interests of heaven" (Encyclical *Arcanum Divinæ*, 1880); and—

"If the laws of the State are manifestly at variance with the Divine Law, containing enactments hurtful to the Church, or conveying injunctions adverse to the duties enjoined by religion; or if they violate, in the person of the Supreme Pontiff, the authority of Jesus Christ: then, truly, to resist becomes a positive duty, to obey is a crime" (*Sapientiæ Christianæ*, 1890); and—

"Although, in the extraordinary condition of these times, the Church usually acquiesces in certain modern liberties, she does so not because she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient to permit them until, in happier times, she can exercise her own liberty. . . . [Some men] despoil the Church of the nature and rights of a perfect society; and maintain that it does not belong to her to legislate, to judge, or to punish, but only to exhort, to advise, and to rule her subjects in accordance with their own consent and will. By such opinion they pervert the nature of this divine society, and attenuate and narrow its authority" (*Libertas Præstantissimum Donum*, 1888).

The Roman Church, then, retains—theoretically, at any rate—all its mediæval claims to dominance over individuals and over States, and to repudiation of the principle of tolerance. This matter needs careful analysis; and the first thing that strikes the student is that there is a logical fallacy in supposing that even a claim to infallibility in teaching would necessarily justify a further claim to be intolerant. Truth of teaching is one thing; perception of that truth by other people is another thing. As the late Dr. George Salmon said (*The Infallibility of the Church*, ed. 1914, pp. 47-48): "It is common with Roman Catholics to speak as if the use of private judgment, and the infallibility of the Church, were things opposed to each other. They are fond of contrasting the peace, and certainty, and assurance of him whose faith rests on the rock of an infallible Church, with the uncertainty of him whose

belief rests only on the shifting sands of his own fallible judgment. . . . But it is clear that our certainty, that any of the things she [Rome] teaches us is right cannot be greater than whatever certainty we have that our private judgment has decided the question rightly whether we ought to submit unreservedly to her teaching."

No institution, in other words, can make, as against dissenters from its beliefs, any greater claims than those based on probable evidence. In matters of secular State-laws, that does not matter. The State exists not on a basis of abstract truth, but in order to guard the general welfare. Therefore, the State can enact coercive laws without needing a philosophic basis of certitude. In theology, however, it is different. A Church, such as the Roman, claims not merely that its doctrine is beneficial to humanity, but that that doctrine is true *per se*. That truth, however, can be made known to others only by probable evidence. Even if —as the Roman Church also says—its adherents know that its teaching is true, not solely by reason of the probable evidence, but also by a supernatural gift of faith : still, that faith would be a possession only of individual souls, and could not be conveyed, by them, to other people as *evidence* : especially when we remember that other people, differing, in their beliefs, from the belief of the Roman Church, profess to have equally strong faith in other doctrines.

Philosophically, then, the claim of a Church to dominate States, and to be intolerant, is unjustifiable. As existing in the Roman Church, those claims are survivals from the times of Innocent III. and Boniface VIII. Their existence, and wide acceptance, in those mediæval days, was quite natural ; but their existence, and subsequent maintenance, is quite sufficient to explain the penal laws against Roman Catholicism after the Reformation. The Roman Church held that heretics should not be tolerated ; that it was a duty of civil rulers to extirpate them ; that, if a civil ruler himself became a heretic, he lost his right to rule : and the Roman Church held also that these maxims could be enforced by might and arms ; prosecution, and even death, against

individuals; war, against States. Clearly, such being the state of the case, separation from the Roman Church, by any community, meant war. A community, or a government, could maintain such independence only by force: and the force necessarily took the form of penal laws against Roman Catholics. It was the logical consequence of Roman canon law itself. In time—when the independence had been firmly established—such laws would become needless, and indeed obnoxious; but the dangers, against which they were the sad but unavoidable defences, lasted a long time.

For example, take the case of Titus Oates's "Popish Plot." Oates was one of the vilest of men: a liar, a murderer, a gross impostor. His tales were incredibly absurd. All this no one can deny: yet there was, at the time, a real danger, distinct from Oates's fictitious ones: and the real danger explains the credence given to Oates's lies. "Jesuit agents and the Duke of York's [afterwards James II.] confidential secretary—for such in fact Coleman was—had something more to do than to entertain themselves by writing at length and in cipher to all parts of Europe with no other intention than to express their hopes for the propagation of the Catholic faith in a manner quite detached from politics, or to discuss political schemes as matters of speculative interest; such things are not done from amusement. Coleman's phrases are pregnant with real meaning. They are to be understood literally. The design which his letters sketch was in substance the same as that afterwards put into practice when the Duke of York ascended the throne as James II. Under the guise of a demand for liberty of worship, it was a design to turn England into a Roman Catholic state in the interest of France and the Jesuits, and by the aid of French money. . . . There can be no doubt that the subjects who took part with Charles II. in the Treaty of Dover were guilty of high treason, none the less because the man who was king acted in concert with them. And similarly, none the less because they expressed the intention of bribing the king to assist their design, no doubt can exist that Coleman and his associates were brought by

their schemes under the penalty of the same crime. Such was the state of the Roman Catholic designs—the real Popish Plot—in England at the close of the year 1675 " (John Pollock, *The Popish Plot*, 1903, pp. 44 and 48-49).

The truth is that the constitution of the realm—its civil and spiritual independence—was in danger to a very considerable degree until after the " abdication " of James II. and the final failure of attempts to upset the subsequent Protestant dynasty. Even if there were no real danger of success of attempts against that constitution and civil and spiritual independence, yet there was danger of very perilous turmoil at least. Again, to quote Mr. Pollock (pp. 56-57): " A man looking back [from our own times] on the history of the seventeenth century, and guided by the story of the Revolution, can say with assurance that any attempt in the latter half to restore Catholicism in England must have been hopeless of success. The nation which drove out James II. would have driven out another for a like cause. Charles himself had learnt this in the best of schools. The fact may have been plain to clear-sighted statesmen, but to the mass the restoration of the old religion was looked on as among events that were more than possible. Here was the root of the deep hatred of Catholicism cherished by the English nation. Not only was the event hoped by the one side, but it was feared by the other. And the hopeful party had more reason to hope than the fearful to fear. Englishmen might with justice anticipate intrigues and even plots, but never their success. But the Jesuit, whose education was Continental and whose ideas were traditional, was unaware of the change that had passed over England. He was still inspired by the genius and followed the example of the dead Robert Parsons. His mind was filled with the great instances of past times. Henry VIII., Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, had drawn their subjects with them like sheep from one Church into another. Within the memory of man a wave of Puritanism had swept over the country, tottered, and broken. There followed a loyal reaction and a Court in which strong elements were Catholic.

The people who had so willingly followed their leaders before might be expected to do so again. The hope of rebuilding the ruins of Jerusalem was strong in the belief of its possibility."

For a century and a half after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, in fact, this realm was in a state of self-defence against a religio-political danger. For half that time the danger was of the positive subversal of the new order of things; for the other half, of *attempts at* such subversal: attempts the defeat of which would have entailed grievous turmoil. No doubt the apostles of the old order of things believed that old order better than the new, and therefore thought its restoration a good and holy aim. They were entitled to their opinion: but equally were the adherents of the new order entitled to *theirs*—and to take steps to defend it.

The story of these struggles is tragic to a degree: though the tragedy is relieved by the heroism on both sides. When, however, we go down to the basic principles involved, it is clear where the right lay. The old order of things meant obscurantism and unprogressiveness. The new order, for all its defects, was logically bound (even in spite of its own adherents all too often) to move forward and upward.

The idea of the mediæval polity was that the welfare of the people must be safeguarded by a Pontiff supreme over kings, and keeping those kings in check. Faultily though the idea worked, it probably was the only possible one then. The truer ideal is, however, of individual freedom of conscience, and democracy as against despotic rulers. By vindicating the right of private judgment, the Reformation gave that ideal a chance to develop: though it required a grievous struggle. The very preciousness of the ideal makes it needful to be eternally vigilant against any attempts to go back on it.

No student of history will deny the nobility of the annals of the Latin Church: any more than any student will deny its tragic blemishes. The blemishes were, and are, grave

enough—and more than enough! The holiness and high heroism were, and are, there also, however: not merely the holiness and heroism of great and famous souls, but also that of obscure and humble ones—souls, for instance, who, unknown to fame, live lives modelled on plans like that expressed in these words by the late Father F. W. Faber (*Growth in Holiness*, 1872, p. 29): "I have made a short map of the spiritual life in my own mind. I have divided it into three regions of very unequal extent and of very diversified interest. First there comes the region of beginnings, a wonderful time, so wonderful that nobody realises how wonderful it is, till they are out of it, and can look back on it. Then stretches a vast extent of wilderness, full of temptation, struggle, and fatigue, a place of work and suffering, with angels, good and bad, winging their way in every direction, the roads hard to find and slippery underfoot, and Jesus with the cross meeting us at every turn. This is ten or twelve times the length of the first region. Then comes a region of beautiful, wooded, watered, yet rocky mountains, lovely yet savage too, liable to terrific tempests and to those sudden overcastings of bright nature, which characterise mountainous districts. This last is the land of high prayer, of brave self-crucifixions, of mystical trials, and of heights of superhuman detachment and abjection whose rarefied atmosphere only chosen souls can breathe."

It is this holiness that is the essence of goodness in Roman Catholicism: but, after all, it is not Roman Catholics *only* who have gone on pilgrims' progresses! The spirit bloweth where it listeth. The idea that divine truth requires an exclusivist Church to guard it is a plausible idea: but it is a fallacious one. It tends to produce spiritual and social tyranny. Also it is contradicted by the manifest facts of life, which show that holiness and loftiness of soul are found in every creed. The fact is, formal dogmas are not final. They express aspects of truth so far as they can. In Christianity they are of especial value as expressing them in relation to a uniquely Divine Person. They cannot be,

however, so final and exclusive as the Roman theory supposes. The very effort to maintain that theory involves, indeed, tragic difficulties. It is a theological maxim of Roman theology that "outside the Church—the one true Church, the Roman Catholic Church—there is no salvation": *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. "It is altogether a necessity of salvation," said Boniface VIII. in his Bull *Unam Sanctam*, "that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff." Yet what theologian takes these maxims literally? It is explained that what is meant is that the only covenanted way of salvation is that laid down in Roman teaching, but that it may be that many will be saved in "uncovenanted ways," and in spite of their rejecting the "covenanted" ways. Is that not, however, really an abandonment of the position? Why not frankly recognise that maxims, such as *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, if they allude to a visible Church-government on earth, are examples of exaggerating the power of an institution? Let us reverence the august history of Latin Catholicism. It could not have lasted so long had it not been—were it not still—the vehicle of great good. Truth, however, is vaster than any Church or any other institution. By the fullest possible liberty of conscience—not in legal fact only, but in the mutual attitude of men to men—we lead to an indefinitely great increase of true knowledge.

> "Let knowledge grow from more to more:
> But more of reverence in us dwell—
> That mind and soul, according well,
> May make one music, as before."

It is a duty of the wise, then, to oppose laws or theories founded on intolerance, and to promote the co-operative search for more and more truth by many and various types of minds. Who can say how fair might be the prospect of intellectual and social betterment opened up by an adequate realisation of that duty? The subject, however, is too great for treatment at the conclusion of a book. I can say no more here now.

A SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

It is not pretended that the books in this list are more than a selection. The subjects dealt with would exhaust many pages if a really adequate bibliography were compiled. The following works are among the most useful:

The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England. By Right Rev. Bernard Ward, R.C. Bishop of Brentwood. 2 vols. Longmans, London, 1909.

The Eve of Catholic Emancipation. By same writer. 3 vols. Longmans, 1911.

The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation. By same writer. 2 vols. Longmans, 1915.

Catholic London a Century Ago. By same writer. Catholic Truth Society, London, 1905.

A Manual of the Law specially affecting Catholics. By W. S. Lilly and J. E. P. Wallis. Clowes, London, 1893.

Memoirs of Missionary Priests. By Bishop Challoner. T. C. Jack, Edinburgh, 1878. (British Museum, 4905, i. 7.)

A Defence of English Catholics. By Cardinal Allen. Manresa Reprint. 2 vols. Roehampton Press, London, 1913.

Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries. Bell, London, 1920. *The Last Abbot of Glastonbury.* Simpkin, Marshall, London, 1895. *Monastic Life in the Middle Ages.* Bell, 1922. *The Eve of the Reformation.* Nimmo London, 1900. All by Cardinal Gasquet.

Studies in Mediæval Life and Thought. Cambridge University Press, 1920. *Five Centuries of Religion.* Same, 1923, etc. *A Mediæval Garner.* Constable, London, 1910. *The Mediæval Village.* Cambridge University Press, 1925. All by Dr. G. G. Coulton.

The Inquisition. By Hoffman Nickerson. Bale, London, 1923.

The Inquisition. By A. L. Maycock. Constable, London, 1926.

Statutes of the Scottish Church, 1225-1559. Edited by D. Patrick. Scottish History Society, 1907.

John Knox and the Reformation. By Andrew Lang. Longmans, 1905.

Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, 1424-1707. H.M. Stationery Office, Edinburgh, 1908.

A History of Scotland. By Andrew Lang. 4 vols. Blackwood, London, 1900-1907.

Ireland under the Stuarts. By R. Bagwell. 3 vols. Longmans, 1909-1916.

The Brehon Laws. By L. Ginnell. Unwin, London, 1894.

The Doubtful Grant of Ireland by Pope Adrian IV. investigated. By L. Ginnell. Fallon, Dublin, 1899.

Outlines of the History of Ireland. By P. W. Joyce. Gill, Dublin, 1894.

The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages. By Mgr. H. K. Mann. 14 vols. Kegan Paul, London, 1902-1928.

The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages. From the German, of Dr. Ludwig Pastor. 16 vols. Hodges and Kegan Paul, London, 1891-1928.

The Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. By W. D. Killen, D.D. 2 vols. Macmillan, London, 1875.

History of Rationalism. By J. F. Hurst, D.D., LL.D. Eaton, New York, 1901.

History of the Church of England. By Canon R. W. Dixon. 6 vols. Smith Elder, 1878-1902.

Magna Carta. By W. S. McKechnie, M.A., LL.B., D.Phil. Maclehose, Glasgow, 1914.

The Statutes of Wales. Edited by Ivor Bowen. Unwin, London, 1908.

The Papal Monarchy. By Dr. William Barry. Unwin, London, 1902.

The Last Years of the Protectorate. By C. H. Firth, M.A. 2 vols. Longmans, 1909.

Canon Law in the Church of England. By F. W. Maitland. Methuen, London 1898.

The Canon Law of Mediæval England. By A. Ogle (a reply to Maitland). Murray, London, 1912.

The History of Freedom. By Lord Acton. Macmillan, 1907.

Historical Essays and Studies. By Lord Acton. Macmillan, 1907.

History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages. By Johannes Janssen, translated by Mitchell and Christie. 16 vols. Kegan Paul, London, 1896-1910.

Lives of the Queens of England. By Agnes Strickland. 8 vols. Colburn, London, 1851-1852.

Lives of the Queens of Scotland. By Agnes Strickland. 8 vols. Blackwood, London, 1859.

Sixteenth Century Marriages. Edited by Chas. A. Bernau, F.S.G. Published by editor, London, 1911.

The Popish Plot. By John Pollock. Duckworth, London, 1903.

The Popish Plot and its newest Historian. By Rev. J. Gerard, S.J. (reply to Pollock). Longmans, 1903.

The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. By Rev. J. H. Pollen, S.J. Longmans, 1920.

England's Fight with the Papacy. By Walter Walsh, F.R.Hist.S. Nisbet, London, 1912.

The Infallibility of the Church. By George Salmon, D.D. Murray, 1914.

History of the Reign of Philip the Second. By W. H. Prescott. 3 vols. Routledge, London, 1859.

Codex Juris Canonici (New Code of Roman Canon law). Vatican Press, Rome, 1926 (Burns and Oates, London).

How the Reformation Happened. By H. Belloc. Cape, London, 1928.

Hilaire Belloc Keeps the Bridge. By J. W. Poynter. Watts, London, 1929.

The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation. By Denis Gwynn. Longmans, 1928.

The Reformation in Relation to Modern Thought. By Charles Beard, B.A. Williams and Norgate, 1897.

A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy. By Isaac Barrow; 1680. Scottish Reformation Society ed., Edinburgh, 1852.

A History of the Church of France. By Rev. W. H. Jervis, M.A. 2 vols. Murray, 1872.

The Message and Position of the Church of England. By Rev. A. Galton, B.A. Kegan Paul, 1899.

A Manual of Catholic Theology. By Wilhelm and Scannell. 2 vols. Kegan Paul, 1909.

Hallam's, Macaulay's, Green's, and Lingard's *English Histories;* Freeman's *Norman Conquest;* the English Dominican Fathers' translation of *St. Thomas Aquinas;* The *Encyclopædia Britannica, Catholic Encyclopædia, Jewish Encyclopædia, Schaff-Hertzog.*

INDEX

Adrian IV., Pope, 58
Anglican Orders, 179
Aughrim battle, 70

"Back Lane Parliament," 153
Bannockburn battle, 39
Barbados, Irish slaves at, 69
Barnardo's Homes, Dr., 188
Baronets, 65
Barry, Gerald, 66
Beatification of martyrs, 34
Beaton, Archbishop, 43
Beche, Abbot of Colchester, 21
Bede, Venerable, 56 *ff.*
Benedict XIV., Pope, 13
Berwick siege, 40
Birrell, Augustine, 167
Boniface VIII., Pope, 73
Bourke, Sir John, 66
Bourne, Cardinal, 36, 179
Boyne battle, 70, 109
Breakspeare (see Adrian IV.)
Britons and Saxons, 56
"Brother Abraham," 145
Browne, Archbishop, 60
Bruce, King Robert, 39
Burchard, Bishop of Worms, 53
Burleigh, Lord, 27
Butler, Charles, 149

Cæsar, Julius, 55
Caius, Dr., 8
Campion and Parsons, 26, 28
Carthusian martyrs, 14
Catholic Association, 155, 187
  Committee, 147, 149
  Council for International Relations, 185
  Directory, 176
  Evidence Guild, 184
  Federations, 184
  Herald, 189
  Missionary Society, 184
Catholic Prisoners' Aid Society, 188
  Reading Guild, 183
  Social Guild, 186
  Times, 189
  Truth Society, 182
  Union, 187
  Workers' College, 186
Cecil (see Burleigh)
Celtic Church, 55 *ff.*
Cerdicsford battle, 56
Challoner, Bishop, 140, 149
Charlemagne, 80
Children of Mary, 188
Chisholm, Bishop of Dunblane, 47
Cisalpinism, 147, 149, 170, 175
Clitheroe, Margaret, 28
Clonmacnois synod, 69
Colchester Abbey, 21
"Coleman's letters," 69
Commonwealth, the, 33, 69
Communicatio in Sacris, 29, 162
Confessional, 162
Constantine, Emperor, 77
Constantinople, 81
Constitutions of Clarendon, 4
Convention of 1688, 114, 117
  of the Estates (Scotland), 46
Converts' Aid Society, 183
  to Rome, 176
Cooke, Abbot (see Faringdon)
Coronation of Popes, 194
Corpus Christi Day, 94
Corruption of Parliament, 123
Cotton, George, 9
Council of Constance, 95
  of Toulouse, 83
  of Trent, 62
  of Treves, 53
Cranmer, 17
Crayford (see Crecgansford)
Crecgansford battle, 56
Cromer, Archbishop, 59
Cromwell, Oliver, 66

Cromwell, Thomas, 20
Crusade of Rescue, 188
Culloden battle, 129
Curwen, Archbishop, 61

Darvel Gathern, 15
Declaration of Right, 114
Defence, Cardinal Allen's, 27
Defenders, the, 138
Deposition of Marian bishops, 8
  Papal Bull of, 24, 106
Derry (see Londonderry)
Devonshire rising (1549), 23
Disestablishment, Irish, 166
Dogma, 192, 200
Dopping, Bishop, 131
D'Ossat and Fieschi, legates, 39
Douai College, 25
Dowdall, Archbishop, 59
Drogheda siege, 66
" Dues," 161

Eappa, the Mass-priest, 57
Edict of Nantes, 113
Edward II., King, 39
  VI., King, 6, 14, 23, 98
Eirik, Archbishop of Nidaros, 81
Elizabeth, Queen, 7, 23, 47, 61, 99
Emancipation, Roman Catholic, 130 *ff.*
Émigrés, 170
Errington, Bishop, 178
Ethelbert, King, 56
Ethelwald, 57
Eucharistic Congress of 1908, 174
Excommunication, mediæval, 87
Execution of Justice in England, 27
Extra ecclesiam nulla salus, 201

Faber, Rev. F. W., 200
Faringdon (Cook), Abbot of Reading, 20
Felton, John, 24, 36
Fisher, Cardinal John, 16
FitzAlan, Lord, 187
Fitzgerald, Sir John, 63
Fletcher, Rev. Philip, 183
Forest, Friar, 15
Fortescue, Sir Adrian, 19
Francis, Rev. Mr., persecuted, 152
  II., French King, 47
Frederick II., Emperor, 86

Garden of the Soul, 141, 183
General Assembly, Scottish, 46
Geraldines, 63
Gladstone, W. E., 166
Glastonbury Abbey, 20
Gonville Hall, 8
Gordon Riots, 147
Govan, William, 50
Grattan, Henry, 139, 140
Great Schism of the West, 95
Gregory I. (Great), Pope, 56
  IX., Pope, 83
  XIII., Pope, 45
Guild of the Blessed Sacrament, 188
Gunpowder Plot, 32
Guthrie, James, 50

Hamilton, Patrick, 42
" Hedge-Schools," 71, 166
Heretics, Sir T. More on, 17
Hierarchy, Roman Catholic, in England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, 62, 168, 175, 176
" Holy Maid of Kent," 17
Hosius of Cordova, 77
Houghton the martyr, 14
Howard, Philip, Earl of Arundel, 31

Independence, American War of, 139
Infallibility, 195
Innocent III., Pope, 80, 83
Inquisition, 83
Irish Church, early, 57
Isle of Wight, 57

James I., King, 11, 14, 32, 49, 66, 69
  II., King, 11, 51, 52, 70, 110, 113 *ff.*, 197
Jesuits, 25, 27 *ff.*, 188
  laws against, 27 *ff.*
Jewel, Bishop John, 7, 108
John, King, 80
  XXII., Pope, 39

Keble, Rev. J., 171
Kentwin, 56
Kilkenny synod, 66
Knights of St. Columba, 187
  of the Blessed Sacrament, 188
Knox, John, 43

Latimer, Hugh, 15
" Leakage " from Rome, 176
Leo XIII., Pope, 37, 168, 179, 186, 194
Limerick treaty, 70, 119
Londonderry siege, 118
Lords of the Congregation, 43
Louis XIV., French King, 113
Luitprand, 79
Luther, 4
Lyndwood, mediæval lawyer, 86

Magna Charta, 80
Manning, Cardinal, 178
" Martyr," What is a? 13
Martyrs, English Roman Catholic, 13 *ff.*
Mary Tudor, Queen, 6, 23, 34, 60, 99
Massacre of Glencoe, 117
Maynooth synod (1831), 160
Memoirs of Missionary Priests, 142
Milner, Bishop, 149
Moffatt and Ogilvie, S.J., 36, 51
Monasteries, suppression of the English and Scottish, 6, 20, 42, 96
More, Sir Thomas, 3, 17
Mortmain, 4
" Mystery," 192

Newman, Cardinal, 171
Newton, Adam, Friar, 40
Nicene Council, 77
" Ninety-Eight, The," 152
Normans in Ireland, 59
Northumberland, T., Earl of, 31

" Oakboys," 138
Oates, Titus, 33, 69, 197
O'Connell, Daniel, 155
O'Fihel, Bishop, 61
Ogilvie, John (Jesuit), 36, 51
Old Sarum, 56, 124
O'Neill, Hugh, 63
  Owen Roe, 66
  Shane, 63
Orders, Anglican, 179
Organisations, Roman Catholic, 182 *ff.*
Oxford Movement, 171

Pale, the Irish, 59
Panic in London (1746), 129
Parsons and Campion, 28, 102
Patrick, St., 57
Paul III., Pope, 17
  IV., Pope, 100
" Peep-o'-Day Boys," 138
Pepin the Frank, 79
Percy, T., Earl of Northumberland, 31
Persons (see Parsons)
" Persuading to Popery," 31
Peter Martyr, 7
Peter Plymley's Letters, 144, 145
Philip the Fair, 72
Pilgrims' progresses, 200
Pitt, 149, 153
Pius IV., Pope, 47, 100
  V., Pope, 24, 37, 106
  IX., Pope, 175
  XI., Pope, 34
" Planters " in Ireland, 64
Plumtree, Thomas, 24
Plunket, Archbishop Oliver, 33, 69
Pole, Margaret, 22
  Reginald, 22
Pollock, J., quoted, 197
" Popish Plot," 33, 69, 197
" Popular Monarchy," 111
Potato famine in Ireland, 137, 163
Poynter, Bishop, 150
Præmunire, 4, 95
" Prayers," word for Mass, 169
Press, the Roman Catholic, 189
Prestonpans battle, 128
" Priest-hunters," 134
Prima primaria (see Sodality)
Protestant Association, 148
Provisors, 5

Quarantotti rescript, 154

Racial hate in Ireland, 59 *ff.*
Ransom, Guild of, 182
Reading Abbey, 20
Rebellion of 1798, 152
Red Hand of Ulster, 65
" Reek of Mr. Patrick," 42
Regino, Abbot of Prume, 53
Relief Act of 1791, 147
Rerum Novarum, 186
Riots, Scottish, 43
Risings of 1715 and '45, 128
Rotten boroughs, 123
Russell, Lord John, 175

Salmon, Dr. George, quoted, 195
Saxons and Britons, 56
Scottish abbeys, 42, 43
Searo-byrig (Old Sarum), 56
Seminarists, 25
Shaxton, Bishop, 3
Sidney, Sir Henry, 63
Slaves, Irish, 69
Smith, Dean S. (see *Peter Plymley's Letters*)
Society for Maintenance of Holy See, 187
Sodality, Jesuit, 188
Soggarth Aroon, 135
Southwell, Robert, 31
Spekynton's troubles, 87
Spencer, Herbert, quoted, 193
" Stations," 162
" Steelboys," 138
Stephen II., Pope, 79
St. George's Cathedral, 172
St. Mary's, Moorfields, 150
Storey, John, 24
St. Vincent de Paul Society, 188
Sverri of Norway, 81

Tablet, The, 189
Tichborne, Nicholas, 31
Toleration Act of 1689, 128
Toulouse Council, 83
Treaty of Limerick, 70, 119
Tredagh (see Drogheda)
Trent Council, 62
Treves Council (1310), 53
Troubadours, 82
" Tulchan bishops," 48
" Tyburn Walk," 183
Tyndale, Sir T. More on, 17
Tyrconnell, Earl of, 70

Ulster, 64, 138
Unam Sanctam Bull, 73
" United Irishmen," 152
Universe, The, 189
Universities, Irish, 167
Urban IV., Pope, 94
Usher, Archbishop, 66

Vaughan, Cardinal, 178
Veto, the, 154
Vicars-Apostolic, 140 *ff.*

Wakes, 161
Walburger of Anhalt, 53
Warham, Archbishop, 17
Waucop, Archbishop, 59, 62
Wellington, Duke of, 155
Westphalia, Peace of, 123
Wexford massacre, 68
Whitby synod, 57
" Whiteboys," 137
Wight, Isle of, 57
William and Mary, 114 *ff.*
Winzet, Ninian, 44
Wiseman, Cardinal, 173
Wishart, 43
Witchcraft, 52
Wool, Irish Industry, 136
Wulfhere, 57

Yorkshire Papists' sufferings, 11

Zacharias, Pope, 79

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER

DATE DUE

BR 375 .P68 1930

Poynter, James William, 1885-

The Reformation,
Catholicism, and freedom

,057

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BR0375.P68 1930
Poynter, Jame The Reformation, Catholici
3 0645 0006 0368 4